

[Solicitors' Journal,
Oct. 29, 1881.]

THE

SOLICITORS' JOURNAL

AND

REPORTER.

PRINTED BY J. H. BARNES & CO. LTD.

PRINTED

J. H. BARNES & CO. LTD. 10, ABchurch Lane, LONDON, E.C. 4.

VOLUME XXV.

1880-81.

NOVEMBER 6, 1880, TO OCTOBER 29, 1881.

LONDON: 52, CAREY STREET, W.C.

1881

NAMES OF CASES DISCUSSED IN THIS VOLUME.

Abbiss v Burney, C. A. 717
 Arthur, Re, Arthur v Wynne, M. R. 7
 Ashworth v Munn, C. A. 7
 Blenkhorn v Penrose, Ch. D. 236
 Carrard v Meek, C. P. D. 236
 Clay and Tetley, Re, C. A. 45
 Cope, In re, Cope v Cope, M. R. 113
 Darrell v Tibbitts, C. A. 113
 Emmett, In re, Emmett v Emmett, Ch. D. 773

Grange, In re, Cooper v Todd, Ch. D. 774
 Holland, In re, C. A. 774
 Holroyde, In re, M. R. 754
 Hoole v Smith, Ch. D. 754
 Jones v Rimmer, C. A. 236
 Knowles, Re, Roose v Chalk, V. C. M. 7
 Methuen and Blore's Contract, In re, M. R. 739
 Mudge v Adams, Pr. D. 313
 Roose, In re, Evans v Williamson, M. R. 313

Rudow v Great Britain Mutual Life Assurance Company, C. A. 753
 Seal v Claridge, C. A. 754
 Silkstone and Dodworth Coal and Iron Co., In re, Ex parte Perkins, Ch. D. 793
 South Kensington Co-operative Stores, In re, Ch. D. 793
 Sullivan v Metcalfe, C. A. 216
 Thomas v Patent Lionite Co., C. A. 753

NAMES OF CASES REPORTED IN THIS VOLUME.

BANKRUPTCY REGISTRARS.

Barker, Ex parte, Re Rogers, 373
 Barnett, Moss, & Co., Re, 453
 Baunett, Ex parte, 750
 Bear, Re, 606
 Beart, Ex parte, Re Mitchell, 51
 Boulden, Re, 318, 472
 Brown, Ex parte, Re Inns, 219
 Butcher, Re, 75
 Byrne, Re, 157
 Cape, Ex parte, Re Bridge, 509
 Challis, Re, 240
 Clarke, Re, Ex parte The Trustee, 545
 Cotton, Re, 299
 Davis, Re, 12, 119
 Dummere, Re, 394
 Ferris, Re, 642
 Findlay, Ex parte, Re Collie, 430
 Foreman, Ex parte, Re Roberts, 299
 Gotobed, Re, 290
 Harness, Ex parte, 290
 Harris, Re, 355
 Jacobs, Re, 318
 Kraft, Re, 137
 Lindsay, Ex parte, 641
 Lloyd, Re, 96
 Locke, Ex parte, Re Pennington, 119
 Lord, Ex parte, Re Cliff, 298
 Lovering, Ex parte, Re Simons, 51
 Miller, Ex parte, 670

Nash and Lienard, Ex parte, Re The Earl of Perth, 97
 Nevill, Ex parte, Re Upton, 157
 Nobbs, Re, 319
 Planque, Re, 118
 Raubaut, Re, 157
 Shubbrook, Ex parte, Re Eiford, 75, 96
 Slattery, Re, 393
 Spain, Ex parte, 526
 Stevens, Re, 645
 Stuart, Ex parte, Re Hargrave, 51
 Tilley, Ex parte, Re Weld, 393
 Vale, Ex parte, Re Bannister, 561
 Vendrell, Ex parte, Re Ramos and Vendrell, 31
 Warner, Re, 563
 West, Ex parte, Re Salisbury, 451
 Williams, Ex parte, 281

COUNTY COURTS.

Fyfe v Committee of Lancaster Agricultural Society, 16
 Gott v Sutcliffe, 203
 Lawrence v Simpson, 263
 Laycock v Tweedale, 173
 Patimora v Parker, 477
 Salisbury, Corporation of, v Davis, 437
 Sampson v Marshman, 204
 Thompson, Re, 202

RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Huddersfield Corporation and Chamber of Commerce v Great Northern Railway Co., 785
 James v Taff Vale Railway Co., 683
 Richardson v Great Northern Railway Co., 835
 Tharsis Sulphur and Copper Co. (Limited) v London and North-Western Railway Co., 590

SOLICITORS' CASES.

Barker v Stone, 319
 Edmunds, Re, 680
 Fildes, Re, 763
 Gilbert v Terry, 543
 Hunt, E., Re, 732
 —, L., Re, 690
 Incorporated Law Society v Shaw, 593:
 — v Waterlow, 593
 Kisch, Re, 32
 Mason v Aird, 536
 Merriman, Re, 119
 Murphy, Re, 220
 Poole, Re, 563
 Shearman, Re, 409
 Solicitor, A., In re, 31, 131, 163, 394, 612, 697
 Talley, Re, 610
 Tedder, Re, 230
 Webb v Carew, 121

NOTES OF CASES OF THE WEEK.

Adams v Army and Navy Hotel, 523
 Albion Life Assurance Society, In re, 23, 779
 Allard, Ex parte, 277
 Alma Spinning Company, Re, 49
 Ames' Settlement, In re, 875
 Anglo-French Union Bank, In re, 758
 Anglo-Universal Bank v Eaton, 794
 — v Tramways and General Works Company, 794
 Arkwright v Newbold, 333
 Arncliffe, Ex parte, 359
 Ashton v Sherbrook, 95
 Aslett v Southampton, Corporation of, 49
 Attorney-General v South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Joint Committee, 631
 Augustinus v Nerinckx, 49
 Austin v Bird, 777
 Bacon, Ex parte, 407
 Bainbridge v Browne, 561
 Banner, Ex parte, 445
 Barber's Settled Estates, In re, 679
 Barker, In re, 238
 Barkshire v Grubb, 641
 Barrow, Ex parte, 606
 Bashford v Chaplin, 743
 Beckett v Attwood, 525
 Boddall v Maitland, 335, 372
 Bevers, Ex parte, 740
 Belgravia Ice Company, Re, 803
 Benbow v Low, 29
 Benzcke v Craddock, 317

Bennett, Ex parte, 279
 Bergmann v Macmillan, 354
 Best, Ex parte, 775
 Bethlehem and Bridewell Hospitals, Governors of, v Ironmongers' Company, 429
 Bingham v Sheffield Waterworks, 519
 Birchall, In re, 30
 Bird v Harris, 117
 Birmingham and Lichfield Junction Railway Company, In re, 557
 Blakey, Ex parte, 94
 Blythe, Ex parte, 393
 Boetock v Pearson, 257
 Bowden v Universities Co-operative Association, 886
 Brescia (Province of) Steam Tramway Company, In re, 794
 Breton, In re, Breton v Woolven, 430
 Breull, Ex parte, 135
 Briggs v George, 743
 — v Massey, 743
 British Dynamite Company v Krebs, 316
 British Seamless Paper Box Company, In re, 449
 Brooks, Ex parte, 47
 — v Watson, 603
 Brown's Trusts, In re, 542
 Brown, Bailey, and Dixon, In re, 779
 Brown v Sewell, 135
 Browne, Ex parte, 183
 Bruce v Bruce and Laing, 373
 Buckley, Ex parte, 278

Burden, Ex parte, 370
 Burrowes v Forrest, 743
 Bywater v Clarke, 471
 Cape Breton Company, In re, 779
 Carter, In re, 372
 — v Stubbs, 31
 Cartwright, Ex parte, 428
 Caruncho v Stephenson, 939
 Cavander's Trusts, In re, 239
 Cercle Restaurant de Castiglione v Lavery, 777
 Challinor, Ex parte, 116
 Chambers v Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District, 834
 Chandler v Pocock, 296
 Chapman, Ex parte, 677
 Charing Cross Advance and Deposit Bank, Ex parte, 47
 Charlton v Charlton, 329
 Chatterton v Wastley, 429
 Chaston v Seago, 680
 Clay and Tetley, In re, 11
 Cockburn v Edwards, 756
 — v Ellis, 117
 Coltman v Coltman, 779
 Conacher v Conacher, 199
 Conybeare v Lewis, 334, 721
 Cooper, In the Goods of, 336
 Costa Rica (Republic of) v Strousberg, 29
 Coudry v Bartram, 95
 Crowthorpe v Salter, 625
 Crouch v Jay, 863

NOTES OF CASES OF THE WEEK.

- Cunliffe v Newton**, 721
Dale, In re, 217, 257
Dann, Ex parte, 370
Davies v Midland Railway Company, 778
Davidson v Kimpton, 640
Dawkins v Antrobus, 257
Day v Finch, 354
Debenham v Mellon, 93
De La Warr (Earl) v Miles, 391
De Mora v Concha, 239
Dennett v Bull, 949
Dent v London Tramways Company, 49
Dicks v Yates, 599
Dickson-Poynder v Cook, 753
Dronfield Silkstone Coal Co., In re, 155
Druff v Wood, 943
Duncan v North and South Wales Bank, 95
Durrant v Stoner, 660
Eager v Farnival, 429
Eames v Hacon, 600
Earp v Devonshire, Duke of, 279
East and West India Dock Co., Ex parte, 677
Edison Telephone Company of London, Re, 240
Edwick v Hawkes, 587
Ellis v Robbins, 507
— v Snowden, 450
Emden v Carte, 580
Emanuel, Ex parte, 399
Enraght, In re, 217
Evans, Ex parte, 408
Evans v Digby, 629
Eyton v Mold, Overseers of, 50
Farina's Trade-Mark, Re, 297
Farr v Hennis, 278
Farrant v Austin, 640
Farrar, In re, 371
Fenwick, Re, Fenwick v Proudfoot, 392, 489
Findlay, Ex parte, 533
Firth House Paper Mills Company, Re, 106
Fisher v Hall, Barnsley, and West Riding Junction Railway and Dock Company, 363
Fitzgerald v Fitzgerald, 435
Flagstaff Silver Mining Company of Utah (Limited), Re, 11
Fletcher v Hudson, 776
Forder, Ex parte, 720
Forrest v Burrows, 742
Fowler, In re, 338
— v Murray, 561
Fowlers v Walkers, 535
Freme v Clement, 240
Fuller, Ex parte, 390
Futcher v Futcher, 778
Gathercole v Smith, 334
General Iron Screw Collier Co., In re, 875
Glover v Gile, 451
Goodman's Trusts, In re, 479
Gosman, In re, 659
Gothenburg Commercial Company, In re, 217
Grange v White, 544
Great Australian Mining Company, Re, 507
Great Britain Mutual Life Assurance Society, In re, 30, 94
Great Eastern Railway Company v East London Railway Company, 95, 427
Great Western Railway Company v Waterford and Limerick Railway Company, 217, 297
Great Wheel Polgooth Mining Company, In re, 757, 874
Greaves, Re, Bray v Tofield, 757
Green, In re, 470
Grundy, Kershaw, & Co., Re, 409
Guebert v Moir, 392
Gurington Slate Quarries, Re, 430
Habeas Corpus, Re, An Application for, 509
Halifax Joint Stock Banking Company v Sowerby Bridge Town Hall Company, 450
Hall, Ex parte, 257
Hamilton v Chaine; Morgan, claimant, 385
Hampshire Co-operative Milk Company (Limited), In re, 117
Harlock v Ashbury, 640
Harrison, Ex parte, 677
— v Cornwall Mineral Railway Company, 609
Harvey, Re, Harvey v Lambert, 323
— v Barnard's Inn, 779
Harvie v Farnie, 154
Hastings v Hurley, 354
Hawkes v Holland, 787
Hayward, Ex parte, 690
Head v Willey, 943
Henley v Bates, 560
Heathcote, In the Goods of, 288
Heatley v Newton, 778
Hendricks v Montagu, 279
Hipkiss v Hildick, 525
Hodges v Laing, 929
Holland, In re, 333
Holmes Marine Life Protection Association v Pilley, 563
Holroyde and Smith, Re, 210
Holt, In re, 93
Hoole v Smith, 451
Horrex, Re, 297
Hudson v Remington, 849
Hutchinson v Hutchinson, 823
Hutton v Brown, 697
Hyam v Terry, 321
Ind v Kayler, 929
Ireland, In re, 391
Jaques, In re, 678
Jones, Ex parte, 688
Kelsey v Dodd, 334
Kirkham v Peel, 46
Knapman v Wretford, 569
Lacey, Ex parte, 134
Ladbury, Ex parte, 585
Laird v Briggs, 316, 741
"Libra" The, 741
Lister, Ex parte, 542
— v Pearson, 834
London and Suburban Building Company v Field, 257
Long v Brown, 279
— v Overden, 354
Lyon v Twaddell, 559
McHenry v Lewis, 777
McLaren, Ex parte, 296
MacLay v Carta Para Gold Mining Company, 886
McMahon v Field, 354
Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, In re, 742
Manning, In re, Pendrey v King, 472
Mapleson, Ex parte, 775
March v Swinburne, 422
Markham v Markham, 10
Marsden v Graham, 678
Mathewes, Ex parte, 315
Mellish v Rose, 392
Merchant Banking Company, Ex parte, 295
Metropolitan District Railway Company, In re, 660
— (The), and Cotton's Trustees, In re, 157
Middleborough, Redcar, &c., Permanent Benefit Building Society, Re, 808
Mitchell v Chapman, 450
Molloy v Kilby, 317
Money v Money, 471
Monk v Monk, 314
Mudge v Adams, 253
Nash v Ends, 95
Nassau Tea Company (Limited), Re, 525
National Mercantile Bank, Ex parte, 78
National Provincial Bank of England, Ex parte, 279, 448
Newdick v Gibbons, 850
Newitt, Ex parte, 296
Newton, Ex parte, 134
Nobell's Explosives Company v Jones, 606
Normanton Iron and Steel Company, In re, 239
Northern Counties' Bank, Re, 874
Northern Counties' Fire Insurance Co., Re, 136
Notlage v Aitken, 634
Oceanic Steam Navigation Company v Sutherland, 73
Oldrieve v Knowles, 450
Palmer, Ex parte, 585
— v Locke, 677
Parker v Wells, 697
Parrot's Trusts, In re, 758
Partridge v Baylis, 544
Paecoe v Richards, 259
Patching v Barnett, 600
Patman v Harland and Bennett, 543
Payne v Jacobs, 834, 850
Pelham Publishing Company, Re, 429
Peters v Lewes and East Grinstead Railway Company, 678
Pike v Fitzgibbon, 497
Pillers, Ex parte, 524
Pillgrem v Pillgrem, 507
Piper, In re, 943
Plating Company v Farquharson, 406
Post v Marsh, 117
Pronger v Freeman, 563
Pannett, Ex parte, 72
Rawson v Patton, 620
Rayner v Brewton, 448
Redgrave v Hurd, 372
Rees, Re, Rees v George, 265
Richards v Cullerne, 741
Richardson, Re, Richardson v Pilliner, 469
Ridgway v Ridgway, 698
Robertson v Robertson, 741
Robinson v Pickering, 316
Ross v Baker, 794
Rosser v Pontypridd and Caerphilly Railway Company, 392
Roxburghe (Duke of) v Cox, 542
Royal Exchange Shipping Company v McMillan, 809
Ruddock, Re, Ruddock v Redgrave, 537
Rudow v Great Britain Mutual Life Assurance Society, 489
Russell v Taitnell, 74
Ruston v Tobin, 932
"St. Petersburg" The, 720
Saldanha v Andrews, 219
Salt v Cooper, 74, 165
Sanders v Searson, 50
Sayer, In re, 660
Seear v Lawson, 116
Septon v Quillian, 747
Sharpe, In re, 697
Sheard, Ex parte, 72, 116
Sherbrook, Ex parte, 73
Silver Valley Mining Company, In re, 767, 794
Slack v Midland Railway Company, 74
Slade v Hulme, 773
Smith v Lucas, 587
Smyle, In re, 353
Snow v Bolton, 157
Snowdon, Ex parte, 391
Solicitor (A), In re, 562, 897
Sotheran v Denning, 317
South Kensington Co-operative Stores, In re, 430
Spencer v Duckworth, 743
Sperling v Rochfort, 48
Spicer, Re, Spicer v Spicer, 544
Stanbank, In re, 116
Standard Discount Corporation (Limited), Re, 136
Streeter, Ex parte, 720
Stubbins, Ex parte, 427
Stuckey v Warton, 900
Suffell v Bank of England, 720
Tatton, Ex parte, 523
Taylor, Re, Taylor v Taylor, 825
— v Pede, 508
Tennant v Ellis, 80
Terrell v Oppert, 634
Thomas v Hounsell, 641
— v Patent Lionette Manufacturing Company, 428
Thorndon v Tall, 679
Thorneys' Trusts, In re, 678
Tolmin v Underhay, 680
Underhay v Smith, 199
Union Bank of Kingston-upon-Hull, Re, 371
Universities Co-operative Association, Re, 929
Vale, Ex parte, 776
Vargues v Royal London Panorama, 850
Varnay v North Metropolitan Tramways Co., 943
Walter v Head, 742, 757
— v Howe, 874
Walters v Walters, 544
Walton, Ex parte, 585
Warner v Mosses, 29
Watson v Cave, 278, 315
— v Leamington College (Limited), 30
Webber, Re, 794
Whateley, Milward, and Company, In re, Wheel Elisabeth Company, Re, 794, 809
Whetzel v Le Marchant, 427
White v Jones, 297
Whiting v Loomes, 334
Whitmore v Farley, 642
Wicks, Ex parte, 467
Wigton (Vicar of), Ex parte, 778
Williams, Ex parte, 91, 775
— v Briscoe, 693
— and Landau's Contract, Re, 875
Willmott v Barber, 659
Willoughby D'Esrosy (Baroness), Ex parte, 935
Winter, Ex parte, 333
Witham v Vane, 524
Witherssea Brick Works, In re, 135
Wolverhampton and Staffordshire Banking Company v Bond, 240
Wood v Swann, 134
Working Men's Mutual Society, Re, 686, 807
Worth, Re, 297
Wye Railway Company v Hawes, 74
Wye Valley Railway Company v Hawes, 153
Yarmouth and Gorleston Tramways, Re, 768
Yeaman, Ex parte, 116
Young, Ex parte, 543
— v Dolman, 48

The Solicitors' Journal.

VOL. XXV.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 5, 1880.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS.....	1
PARLIAMENTARY TRAINS.....	3
BICYCLE LAW.....	4
THE YEAR'S SOLICITORS' CASES.....	5
RECENT DECISIONS.....	7
REVIEWS.....	7
GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.....	9
CASES OF THE WEEK.....	10
LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.....	12
COMPANIES.....	12
OBITUARY.....	13
SOCIETIES.....	14
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.....	14
CREDITORS' CLAIMS.....	15
NEW ORDERS.....	15
COURT CASES.....	16
LEGAL NEWS.....	16
COURT PAPERS.....	17
LONDON GAZETTE, &c., &c.....	19

CASES REPORTED IN THE WEEKLY REPORTER.

Clay and Tetley, In re (App.).....	5
Gosman, In re (Ch.Div. V.C.M.).....	14
Gray v. Siggers (Ch.Div. V.C.M.).....	13
Halsey v. Brotherhood (Ch.Div. M.R.).....	9
Harnett v. Vise (App.).....	7
Lasarus v. Andrade (C.P.Div.).....	15
Moore v. Dickson (Ch.Div. V.C.M.).....	12
Pearks v. Moseley and others (H.L.).....	1
Prison Commissioners v. The Corporation of Liverpool (App.).....	6
West v. Downman (App.).....	6

CURRENT TOPICS.

IT IS UNDERSTOOD that the Lord Chancellor will lend his assistance in the Court of Appeal, when necessary, until the sittings of the House of Lords commence, on the 16th inst.

THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS, having sat three days with the Court of Appeal, will this day (Saturday) take his motions of this week, and on Monday next will hear the petitions which would otherwise have been in the paper for this day.

THE OFFICIALS of the Chancery Division who undertook the vacation work have not had a very easy time of it, if we may judge from the number of orders made. The Vacation Judges have made about 280 orders in court, and the orders made in the chambers of the chancery judges were as near as possible 590, making a total of about 870. In 1879 the total was 850, and in 1878, 820. The vacation is a very different matter now from what it was ten years ago, when only one chancery vacation judge was available, and all the orders made were two or three score in number at most.

THE JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS just made had been already too much anticipated by public opinion and rumour to cause any sense of novelty. In the case of Lord Justice LUSH, a somewhat advanced age is the only drawback to

the high qualifications which all allow him to possess. But, although some circumstances have made the public justly suspicious of the value of too advanced age on the judicial bench, there is no reason to think that the powers of the learned judge are in any serious degree impaired by his having reached a period of life exceeded by that of several of his colleagues who are still vigorous and active. The wide and exact knowledge of the Lord Justice on many branches of law, and his great familiarity with practice—always exercised under the guidance of a clear and vigorous common sense and a steady purpose, not only to further the interests of justice, but to carry out in their spirit the provisions of the new system—will add to the Court of Appeal a member almost too valuable to be spared in the Divisional Court from which he is removed. In the appointment of Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS as his successor, we are glad to recognize one who, by his constant advocacy of law reform, stands pledged to give to the Judicature Act and Rules fair and full operation—a qualification which we think of even greater importance than the familiarity with mercantile law which Mr. WILLIAMS is on all hands allowed to possess.

THE FORM OF THE INFORMATION in the forthcoming State prosecution in Ireland has been looked for with some interest. All the counts appear to charge offences which are included in the ordinary definition of a conspiracy, while the last one, which charges a seditious conspiracy, with other persons unknown, to cause and create discontent and disaffection amongst the subjects of the Queen, and to excite and promote feelings of ill-will and hostility between different classes of her Majesty's subjects, falls distinctly within Mr. Justice STAMMER'S definitions of a seditious conspiracy (Digest of Criminal Law, art. 93) as an agreement with one or more persons "to do any act for the furtherance of any seditious intention common to both or all of them," and his definition of a seditious intention, as an intention "to raise discontent or disaffection among her Majesty's subjects, or to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility between different classes of such subjects." It will be observed that all the counts in the information are for misdemeanors. The law officers of the Crown have probably framed the information in this manner, partly with the view of obtaining a trial by a special jury, and partly to diminish the trouble likely to arise from challenges to the jury, since the right of peremptory challenge (i.e., challenge without cause) does not exist in cases of misdemeanors, although it is usual to allow any reasonable number of objections of this kind to be made by both the prosecution and the defence.

THE CORRESPONDENCE which has appeared in our columns during the last few weeks affords an indication of the extraordinary interest which is felt in the next provincial meeting of the Incorporated Law Society. We ventured some time ago to suggest that more profitable use might be made of these meetings if fewer subjects were introduced; if only questions of immediate practical importance were discussed, and were discussed at greater length; and, above all, if men whose judgment and knowledge command respect could be prevailed on to open their lips more frequently. The

meeting at Sheffield fulfilled these requirements more fully than any previous meeting, and the result has been to deepen the conviction that a really valuable purpose is served by these gatherings. No doubt is felt in the best-informed quarters that the Brighton meeting will be larger than any provincial meeting yet held. According to some estimates, the Sussex Law Society will have to provide for 1,000 visitors. That society has, we believe, about fifty members, as against the 117 members of the Sheffield Society. Under these circumstances there is a natural and honourable feeling among the London solicitors (who will constitute a large proportion of the visitors) that it is unfair to leave the Sussex Society to bear the whole of the heavy expenses of such a meeting. There is, moreover, a desire on the part of London members to repay, in some degree, the profuse hospitality invariably bestowed on them at the provincial assemblies. Everyone agrees with our able correspondent who first raised the question, that, in some way or other, the town members of the society should co-operate with the Brighton Society, but the difficulty is how to do this in such a way as not to be distasteful to the society which has so spiritedly undertaken the burden of the meeting. It appears to us that the Sussex Society might, without any impropriety, consent to admit as honorary members solicitors resident in London, and if this were done a ready means would be afforded for the co-operation of town members in the way of subscription to the funds of the Sussex Society.

THE PROCEEDINGS in a prosecution for libel at the Guildhall Police Court on Wednesday seem to show that the case of *Reg. v. Carden* (28 W. R. 133, L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 1) did not entirely settle the practice to be observed in such cases. The solicitor for the prosecution objected to the counsel for the defence cross-examining as to the truth of the libel, but the latter urged that *Reg. v. Carden* only settled that witnesses could not be called before the magistrate in support of the plea of justification, and that it had in no way limited the general right of cross-examination; and ultimately the presiding Alderman adjourned the case, in order that a *mandamus* might be applied for. The question, as now raised, appears to be still to some extent an open one. The Lord Chief Justice said, in *Reg. v. Carden*, that "unless there is some further statutory duty imposed upon the magistrate, the evidence before him must be confined to the question whether the case is such as ought to be sent for trial;" and since he especially noticed and overruled the defendant's argument that, in the event of the prosecutor's death, the defendant would be deprived of the benefit of his cross-examination, he would seem to have contemplated that his decision would have the effect of excluding cross-examination as well as evidence on the part of the accused person. Mr. Justice LUSH observed that, before the passing of the 30 & 31 Vict. c. 35, "all that was to be put into writing was the evidence that was material to the charge against the accused." In *Reg. v. Carden* (as in the recent case) the objection was taken during the cross-examination of the prosecutor, and the rule *nisi* was for a *mandamus* to the magistrate to allow the cross-examination, as well as to hear evidence of the truth of the libel, but the right of cross-examination as to its truth was not expressly dealt with by either of the judges of the Queen's Bench Division.

THE GROUND GAME ACT, 1880, it will have been observed, gives the occupier a right to kill and take ground game concurrently with any other person "entitled" so to do, and the person entitled is ordinarily the landlord by virtue of a reservation. It is somewhat curious, however, that it has never been precisely settled whether this reservation must be by deed or whether an oral reservation is good. At common law the right to take

game (being a *profit à prendre*) is one of those incorporeal hereditaments which can be granted by deed alone, and it is established by a succession of decisions that where there is a lease with a "reservation" of game to the landlord, this is not a reservation at all, strictly so called, but a re-grant of the *profit à prendre* by the tenant to the landlord (see *Wickham v. Hawker*, 7 M. & W. 63). But the Game Act of 1831 (1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 32), whether purposely or from the draftsman's ignorance of the learning of the subject, expressly recognizes a parol reservation in section 8, and protects the landlord in his enjoyment of it by sections 12 and 30. The words of section 8 are, "nothing in this Act contained shall authorize" any person seized of land to kill the game "in any case where, by deed, grant, lease, or any written or parol demise or contract, a right of entry upon such land for the purpose of killing the game hath been, or hereafter shall be, reserved or retained by, or given, or allowed to any grantor, lessor, or other person whatsoever." Section 12 inflicts a penalty on the occupier for killing game, in cases where the right to the game "hath been or shall be specially reserved by, or granted to, the landlord," and section 30, after inflicting a penalty on any person trespassing in pursuit of game, provides that the leave and licence of the occupier shall not be a sufficient defence in any case where the landlord has the right to the game "by virtue of any reservation or otherwise as hereinbefore mentioned"—the reference being obviously to section 8. It has, no doubt, been assumed in more than one case (see *Spicer v. Barnard*, 28 L. J. M. C. 176; *Jones v. Williams*, 46 L. J. M. C. 270) that a parol reservation is good in law to support a conviction under these sections. But until there has been an express judicial decision to the contrary (for the *dictum* of LINDLEY, J., in *Jones v. Williams*, that it follows from section 8 of the Game Act and the decisions upon it that there may be a parol reservation of game upon a parol demise, is not quite conclusive) we think there is some ground for maintaining that the Game Act does not alter the law by altering the mode of transfer of an incorporeal hereditament (for if that had been intended, it would have been effected by express words), but merely protects the landlord in the enjoyment of a revocable licence so long as it remains unrevoked.

THE CHANCERY PAYMASTER'S OFFICE appears to be in a condition of discontent which is the natural result of excess of work beyond the powers of the existing staff, combined with the hope of assistance too long deferred. The authorities of the Treasury, on whom rests the care of providing the requisite addition to the Paymaster's staff of clerks, are taking time to think about doing what must inevitably be done sooner or later. Not only is the staff inadequate to perform the existing work, but it is tolerably certain that before many years it will be called upon to transact a greatly increased business. It is probable that the whole of the funds in court in the common law divisions, will be ultimately administered by the present Chancery Pay-office; and probably the bankruptcy funds will be sent there after a time. In fact, the office (which is really one of the largest banks in London) is not only at present undermanned, but the work is increasing year by year, and in all probability more work will constantly fall to its share. By way of some slight help, the Paymaster has been allowed the assistance of two writers, but their aid is as a drop in the bucket compared with what is really required. There can be no reason on the score of economy for this reluctance to increase the staff. The Chancery Pay-office not only pays its way, but brings a large surplus revenue towards the costs of the administration of justice. Solicitors complain that they cannot procure sufficient attention there, and that they have now to wait several days for the performance of a duty which used to occupy but one day, or two at the

most. If an ordinary banking business were starved in the same manner as the Paymaster's office is starved by the absence of a sufficient working staff, the proprietors would soon hear from their customers. When, however, the business is that of the public, carried on by the Government, the customers find themselves utterly helpless in the way of complaint.

THE CONSTITUTION of the Court of Appeal in each of its divisions is a matter of considerable interest to suitors at the present time. Lords Justices BAGGALLAY, BRAMWELL, and LUSH, being away, there are not sufficient judges in town without the aid of the Master of the Rolls, the Lord Chancellor, and an *ex-officio* judge, to form two full courts of appeal. And the change in the constitution of the divisions leads to considerable inconvenience. Thus, on Wednesday last, at Lincoln's-inn, there were two cases in the paper which had been partly heard before the Appeal Court when differently constituted, and in order to save the trouble of their being re-heard *de novo*, they had to stand out of the paper until precisely the same judges should again form the court as were sitting on the former occasion. This delay and inconvenience is almost unavoidable so long as some of the Lords Justices are compelled to go circuit, and although it might at present, by a little more care, be reduced, it is likely to become a considerable grievance after the time when all the Lords Justices, having been appointed after the Judicature Act, are liable to go circuit.

The question of the fees of counsel is stated to have recently arisen in Canada upon a claim by Mr. Doutré, Q.C., upon the Dominion Government, for services as counsel before the Fisheries Commission, which services he values at 50 dols. a-day, the aggregate being some 20,000 dols. The *Canada Legal News* says that "Mr. Doutré deposed that in the test case of *Angers v. Queen Ins. Co.* he received 500 dols. in fees, although he spent but two days in court. In another case, in which he obtained a 12,000 dol. verdict, he was three days in court, and received 1,800 dols. in fees, besides the taxed costs. In the case of *Grant v. Beaudry*, known as the Orange trial, he was paid 10 dols. per hour. Mr. F. X. Archambault, of Montreal, stated that in the case of *Wilson v. Citizens' Ins. Co.*, the amount claimed in the suit was 2,000 dols., but he received 1,000 dols. as a retainer, besides other fees. In the case of *Holland v. Citizens' Ins. Co.*, his retainer was 2,000 dols. In three *capias* cases which were presented as one, and which lasted about a month, he received 2,800 dols. altogether. In the criminal case of a woman charged with stealing some silks, he received a retainer of 1,500 dols. This client was merely admitted to bail. To defend a criminal case, which would not occupy more than two days, he had received 2,000 dols." These amounts, says the *Albany Law Journal*, seems large, no doubt; but they are by no means unprecedented in this country. There are a number of counsel in the city of New York who command 250 dols. a-day. There would seem to be no reason why a British lawyer should not be paid as much as a British physician, both standing equal in their respective professions; and a British jury recently gave Dr. Phillips a verdict of £16,000 damages for two years' loss of business.

In a case of concealment of birth tried before Mr. Justice Hawkins at Maidstone, the young woman pleaded "Guilty," and the learned judge remarked that he wished that in cases of this class—i.e., cases of mere concealment—the prisoners should, where it was possible, be admitted to bail, as their discharge without further sentence might create the impression that they suffered no punishment; but, on the other hand, it would be obviously unjust not to take into account the imprisonment already suffered.

PARLIAMENTARY TRAINS.

THE *Times* of Wednesday last contained a short correspondence on the subject of "Parliamentary" railway trains, which deserves a passing notice, not only on account of the intrinsic importance of the question raised, but also as a signal instance of the perfunctory manner in which cases out of the ordinary routine are treated in public offices. There is probably no department of the Government service where the public are treated with more consideration than they are by the Board of Trade, and it would be hard to find anywhere a more attentive or courteous gentleman than Mr. Heath's correspondent, and yet, when written to on a question certainly within the scope of his duties, though somewhat out of the common track, he has returned an answer eminently calculated to give the impression—first, that he has never given a thought to the question; and, secondly, that he does not think it worth his while to look into it.

The facts are few and simple. A Mr. Heath, who appears from his address to be an elector of Marylebone, seems to have induced the Recorder to ask a question in the House of Commons respecting the parliamentary tickets issued by the Great Western Railway, and being dissatisfied with the answer given, he wrote to Mr. Chamberlain, giving a number of instances of stations between which, as he alleges, no tickets are obtainable except at rates greatly in excess of the parliamentary scale. He also gives an instance in which, in order to reach London at parliamentary fares, it is necessary to leave Newbury at 8.50 a.m. for Reading, and remain there till 6.25 p.m. before proceeding further. The complaint may or may not be well founded; we have no means of investigating the question, and neither intention nor desire to express any opinion upon it: what we wish to call attention to is the manner in which it is treated by the Board of Trade. The answer of the Board is in the following terms:—

"I am directed by the Board of Trade to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th inst., addressed to the President, in regard to the parliamentary train arrangements on the Great Western Railway. In reply, I am to state that the provisions of the Cheap Train Act, 7 & 8 Vict., c. 85, do not make it obligatory upon a railway company to do more than convey passengers at parliamentary fares by one train at least daily from one end to the other of each trunk, branch, or junction line. It therefore appears that the Great Western Railway Company meet the strictly legal requirements of the Act of Parliament, which do not oblige a company to run a cheap train from every station on a trunk, branch, or junction line to every station on other trunk, branch, or junction lines on their system.

"I am to add that the reply recently given by the President in the House of Commons did not state that parliamentary tickets are issued at and to all stations on the company's system, but merely that parliamentary tickets were issued at all stations."

The effect of this is that, in the opinion of the Board, all that a company are bound to do is to run a train from end to end of their line, carrying, we presume, passengers over that distance, but that they are not in any manner obliged to provide for the conveyance of passengers from any station to any other—except, we suppose, the terminal stations. If this be the true reading of the Act, it is evident that it is quite inadequate to effect the declared object of Parliament, which was to use the railways as a means of cheap intercommunication for all places throughout the country. But a very slight examination of the Act referred to in Mr. Calcraft's letter will show that this is not its true meaning. By the Act the company are required to run from end to end of every trunk, branch, or junction line at least one train each way *per diem* (1) at hours to be fixed by the directors with the sanction of the Board of Trade (and the declared object of the Act throws upon the Board the duty of seeing that these hours are such as to afford

reasonable means of transport over the whole system) (2) stopping at every station, if required (why so, if they are not bound to book passengers to and from every station?) (3) in covered carriages at a specified maximum rate of one penny per mile; and (4) at a specified minimum rate of twelve miles per hour, including stoppages.

It is clear, therefore, that the duty of the company is, first, to carry passengers from any station on their line to any other station at parliamentary rates; secondly, where these stations are situated upon the same trunk, branch, or junction railway, to carry in through carriages, proceeding continuously, and at a rate of not less than twelve miles an hour, including stoppages; and, thirdly, where these stations are situated on different branches of their railway, so to time the trains as to effect convenient "connections," to the satisfaction of the Board of Trade. It is, of course, impossible so to arrange that passengers who have to change carriages shall not be obliged to wait at the junctions for a reasonable—perhaps in some cases even a considerable—time: on a line like the Great Western, with a multiplicity of junctions, it would be impossible to effect this without seriously interfering with the requirements of the other traffic; but a delay of more than eight hours at a single junction in the course of a journey to London—if it is really imposed by the existing arrangements—is so obviously unreasonable and oppressive as presumptively to call, it seems to us, for the exercise by the Board of Trade of their powers of control over the time table.

The other matters of which Mr. Heath complains admit of a ready remedy, though one which is not, we think, within the province of the Board of Trade. Under Lord Cardwell's Act, it is part of the duty of every railway company to afford "all reasonable facilities" for the conveyance of traffic over its line, and it has been decided by the Railway Commissioners, and affirmed upon appeal, that to charge rates in excess of those authorized by Parliament is a breach of this duty; and, further, that "booking" from and to any place from and to which the company is bound to carry—or does, in fact, carry—is a reasonable facility within the meaning of this Act; and we cannot doubt that if the company refuse to issue tickets at parliamentary rates from any station on their line to any other station to which they carry, or to permit passengers to travel with such tickets by any parliamentary trains which they actually run; or, if there be any part of their system over which they do not run the required cheap trains—in any of these cases they could, and would, be compelled to afford the requisite facilities by the Railway Commissioners upon a proper application to them. They could not, we think, interfere with the discretion of the directors as to the hours at which the trains ought to start, unless requested by the Board of Trade to advise them upon this point, but for the purpose of securing to the public the proper enjoyment of such trains as are, in fact, run, this seems to be the proper, and is, so far as we can see, the only available machinery.

But this remedy, like most others, is only open to "a complainant"; and it is idle for Mr. Heath, or any one else, to say that "the individual action of a private person would be futile against a powerful railway company," and thereupon, to call upon a department of the Government to set right, *brevi manu*, and without authority, that for which there exists a remedy duly provided by law, amply sufficient for the purpose, and available as the result of a judicial investigation, in the absence of which any idea of compulsion against the company would savour too much of arbitrary tyranny to be entertained by any public department. It may be a misfortune that in this case, as in others, a remedy which can only be obtained as the result of litigation is often an expensive luxury; but this is a necessary incident of all civilized life, and is in the present case an objection of less force than usual, because, first, the

litigation will take place before a tribunal where the proceedings are simpler and the delays less than in any other court in the country, and where, therefore, the necessary costs (we do not speak of the expenses voluntarily incurred by railway companies, such as the employment of parliamentary agents, counsel, &c.) are exceptionally small; and, secondly, because the defendants are certain to be in every case able to pay any costs which may be awarded against them, so that, if a complaint be well founded, the necessary litigation can be conducted almost without risk. That an ill-founded complaint should entail serious loss is only a proper protection to an innocent defendant.

BICYCLE LAW.

Among the branches of law of recent development, few have made such rapid progress as that relating to bicycles. As we shall presently see, the bicycle has already received the attention of the Legislature; it has occupied and perplexed quarter sessions; it has filled the minds of learned judges of the Queen's Bench Division with doubt; and it has now at length got a case devoted to it in the law reports. These are considerable achievements for a machine so recently introduced.

What is a bicycle? Definition is not easy, and we do not find in any bye-laws relating to bicycles which we have seen, any attempt to define a bicycle. But we observe that in one form of bye-laws a *bicyclist* is defined as "a person riding, or otherwise using, a bicycle on any highway"—a definition which bears a family resemblance to that of the archdeacon as a person exercising archidiaconal functions. We have had, however, within the last few days an attempt at a definition. According to a learned metropolitan police magistrate, a bicycle is a machine with two wheels. A man who was summoned last week at the Wandsworth Police-court for riding a bicycle between sunset and sunrise without having a light attached thereto, pleaded that his machine was not a bicycle but a velocipede; and Mr. Paget is reported to have laid it down that "if there were two wheels to the machine it was a bicycle." Of course, it must be understood that the magistrate intended to include in the definition, besides the two wheels, the fact that one of the wheels is worked by the feet of the rider; so qualified the definition would seem to answer all practical purposes.

A bicycle is a "carriage" within the Highway Act of 1835. This was decided in *Taylor v. Goodwin* (27 W. R. 489, L. R. 4 Q. B. D. 228). In that case counsel for the appellant argued with zeal and ingenuity against this view. He pointed out that bicycles could not possibly have been within the contemplation of the Legislature at the time of passing the Act; that you "ride" a bicycle while you "drive" a carriage, and that if a bicycle is a carriage, a wheelbarrow must be a carriage; nay, even a man trundling a wheel along a highway must be taken to be "driving a carriage." On the other hand, counsel for the respondent contended that anything which carries people is a "carriage," and that to "drive" means to "propel." A bicyclist propels something which carries him; hence he drives a carriage. The Queen's Bench Division were a good deal perplexed. Mr. Justice Mellor said that the question which, when stated at first, seemed a very simple one, and one which would not require lawyers to decide, appeared more doubtful when it came to be argued by lawyers. But the court ultimately acceded to the contention of the counsel for the respondent. The word "carriage," they thought, was large enough to contain a bicycle. The mischief intended to be prevented by the section of the Highway Act in question in the case was the propelling of any vehicle along a highway so as to endanger persons using it. It was immaterial how it was propelled, whether by steam, or by a horse, or "by another animal"—e.g., a bicyclist. The result of this decision is to render the rider of a bicycle

liable to the penalties imposed by section 78 of the Highway Act, 1835, on any person riding or driving furiously so as to endanger life. In *Taylor v. Goodwin* the bicyclist was driving his machine along a highway at the rate of about fourteen miles an hour, and knocked a person down and injured him. Under the section the penalty for this offence is not to exceed £5, in case the driver is not the owner of the carriage, but if he be the owner, the penalty may be £10, and in default of payment he is liable to hard labour. Wherefore it would appear that a bicyclist who undertakes one of those furious races against time which are understood to be essential to attaining distinction in the bicycle world, would be prudent to hire, and not to own, his machine. We do not, however, guarantee that even in that case a court destitute of bicycling enthusiasm might not hold that he was the owner during the time of hiring.

Another consequence of the decision in *Taylor v. Goodwin* is to subject the bicycle-rider to the provisions of section 72 of the Highway Act, 1835, imposing a penalty on any person who wilfully drives any carriage upon any footpath or causeway by the side of any road made or set apart for the use or accommodation of foot passengers. Independently of any local regulations, made under the provision to which we shall presently refer, the bicyclist must keep to the carriage way. He must also (unless the contrary is provided by local bye-laws) keep on the left side of the road (section 78). He need not, however, have his name and place of abode painted on his bicycle, because section 76 of the Act, which requires the owner's name to be painted on every "wagon, cart, or other such carriage" used on any highway, and imposes a penalty upon default, only includes carriages *ejusdem generis* with a wagon or cart. (See *Danby v. Hunter*, 28 W. R. 228, L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 20.)

Coming now to the recent legislation on the subject of bicycles, the Highway Act of 1878 provides, by section 26, that the county authority—that is, the justices in quarter sessions—may from time to time make, with respect to all or any main roads or other highways within any highway area in their county, and, when made, alter or repeal, bye-laws "for regulating the use of bicycles." But by section 35, such bye-laws are not to be of any validity until they have been submitted to, and confirmed by, the Local Government Board. There is no power for the Local Government Board to make bye-laws, or compel the justices to make bye-laws. The result must be, if the power is exercised by quarter sessions, to introduce a singular variety of regulations in different counties. A recent learned writer on the subject of highways says that bye-laws have been framed which practically prevent the use of bicycles; for instance, it has been provided that the bicyclist must place his lamp, after dark, in such a position as to make it impossible for the driver to see anyone approaching on foot; and it has even been provided that the regulations with reference to locomotives on highways, compelling them to stop on any driver or rider on the road holding up his hand, shall apply to bicycles. This is absurd. All that is needed are a few simple rules declaring the law as to the use of the carriage way only by the bicyclist, and as to the side on which he shall pass all vehicles; as to his carrying a lighted lamp attached to his bicycle between certain hours; as to his carrying a whistle or horn when overtaking carriages or foot passengers, and rendering assistance to restive horses. It would be a great advantage to the bicyclist, and probably also to the public who use the highways, if in the next session of Parliament power were given to the Local Government Board to frame and publish regulations as to bicycles which shall be generally binding. It is certainly hard that the bicyclist who undertakes one of those long journeys which are the means of rising to a distinguished position in the fraternity should have to stop on the borders of each county, and inquire what bye-laws are in force there.

THE YEAR'S SOLICITORS' CASES.

THE past year has been rather fertile in cases of importance to solicitors, and we propose to collect from the various series of reports the points in which the law relating to this branch of the profession has been declared or altered.

There have been three decisions on the subject of the lien of solicitors. *Newington Local Board v. Eldridge* (L. R. 12 Ch. D. 349) was a curious case. A local board sought a *mandamus* to compel their former clerk, a solicitor, to deliver to the present clerk to the board all the documents, &c., in his possession belonging to the plaintiffs, and especially all briefs and other papers necessary to enable the present clerk to prosecute an appeal in an action brought by the present plaintiffs against the Cottesingham Local Board, and also for an injunction restraining the defendant from parting with such documents, &c., to any other parties. The defendant had been elected clerk to the board at a salary of £50 a year, which had been afterwards raised to £80 a year, not to include actions, arbitrations, parliamentary proceedings, journeys, &c. The plaintiffs afterwards called upon the defendant to resign the clerkship, and upon his refusing to do so they passed a resolution removing him from his office and directing him to hand over all documents belonging to the board which were in his possession, and they also obtained an order for change of solicitors in the pending action against the Cottesingham Local Board. The defendant claimed a lien upon certain of the documents in respect of the costs of the action. Bacon, V.C., made an order in the terms asked for, holding that the defendant's claim in respect of professional services rendered could not justify him, as the servant of the board, in refusing to produce documents which belonged to the plaintiffs. This order was, however, varied by the Court of Appeal, on the ground that it might prejudice the defendant's lien, and ought not to have been made before the trial of the action. They ordered the giving up of the documents on payment into court by the plaintiffs of a sum sufficient to meet the defendant's claim, the defendant to have the same lien upon the sum paid in as he would have had upon the documents. In *Ex parte Bramble, In re Tolman* (28 W. R. 676, L. R. 13 Ch. D. 885), the question of a solicitor's lien was raised in a bankruptcy proceeding. The solicitor, who had prepared a deed of partnership between two liquidating debtors, refused to produce the deed, or any other papers in his custody belonging to the debtors, to the trustees in the liquidation, on the ground of a lien upon them for the costs of preparing the deed. It was contended on the solicitor's behalf that the trustee could not stand in a better position than the clients themselves, and that the lien was a "lawful impediment" to the production of the documents within section 96 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869; but the Chief Judge, affirming the decision of the county court judge, ordered the production of the documents, holding that the lien of the solicitor was not prejudiced, since he was not required to give them up, but merely to produce them for the trustee's inspection. In *Shippey v. Grey* (28 W. R. 877), the solicitors for the plaintiff in an action against the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company had signed judgment for £400 damages with costs, but, before the costs had been taxed, a judgment creditor of the plaintiff obtained, *ex parte*, a garnishee order attaching all debts due to the plaintiff to answer his judgment. The plaintiff's solicitors then served upon the judgment creditor a notice that they claimed a lien on the sum recovered in the action against the railway company in respect of their costs in that action. The Court of Appeal, affirming the decision of the Common Pleas Division, held that the solicitors were entitled, as against the judgment creditor, to a charging order, under the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127, s. 23, upon the sum recovered, and

that the case was governed by *Faithfull v. Ewen* (26 W. R. 270, L. R. 7 Ch. D. 495).

Ward v. Kyre (28 W. R. 712) is an important decision as to the respective rights of a country solicitor and his town agent. In a suit by a country solicitor for an account against his town agents, the latter claimed a specific balance, with interest. A balance smaller than that claimed was found to be due, and the Court of Appeal, affirming the decision of the Master of the Rolls, held that the defendants could not recover interest on the disbursements or upon the balance due to them. Reliance had been placed by the defendant's counsel upon the 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 42, s. 28, and 33 & 34 Vict. c. 28, s. 17, but the Lords Justices held, with reference to the former statute, that no "demand of payment" had been made, and that no "sum certain" had become payable, since the balance claimed by the defendant had proved to be inaccurate. With reference to the argument founded upon 33 & 34 Vict. c. 28, the court decided that section 17 of that Act was not applicable to the case of a country solicitor and his town agent, since the former was not a "client" within section 3, and also that the statute had no retrospective operation.

The subject of the taxation of costs was dealt with in four cases. In *re Fisher* (42 L. T. N. S. 261) involved the question, what are "special circumstances" within 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, s. 41, justifying the taxation of a bill of costs after it has been settled in account? A charge of felony was pending against the managing clerk of the solicitors, and the case against him involved the *bona fides* and legality of certain items in the bill of costs which referred to a period before the charge was preferred. The Exchequer Division, upon the solicitor's application, ordered that the bill should be taxed, Pollock, B., observing that the fact of the pendency of criminal proceedings was not a sufficient ground for depriving a solicitor of his right, as an officer of the court, to have his bill referred to the proper officer for taxation, the only question being whether there were "special circumstances" to warrant the taxation. In the absence of any proof that the application was a sham one, the circumstances of the present case rendered it fair and reasonable that the items in the bill should be investigated by the taxing officer. In *Philippis v. Philipps* (28 W. R. 376, L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 60), the Queen's Bench Division had refused an application to strike out the statement of claim as embarrassing, but the Court of Appeal reversed this decision, and gave the costs of the appeal and of the proceedings in the court below. The master declined to tax these costs during the pendency of the action, and Field, J., refused an order referring them to taxation. The defendants then brought the matter before the Court of Appeal, who held that the costs must be taxed and paid forthwith, on the ground that the express order of the Court of Appeal overrode the practice of the Queen's Bench Division, according to which the taxation of the costs of an interlocutory application is postponed till the termination of the action. In *Simmons v. Storer* (28 W. R. 408, L. R. 14 Ch. D. 154) the plaintiff had obtained judgment in an action in the Exchequer Division, to enforce which he had taken out several garnishee summonses on which no further proceedings had been taken. The defendant afterwards brought an action against the plaintiff in the Chancery Division in which action an order was made directing an account of the amount due to the defendant in respect of his judgment in the first action, and of the proceedings taken by him to enforce it. The chief clerk referred the bill of costs for taxation to a master of the Exchequer Division, who disallowed the costs of the abortive garnishee summonses. The Master of the Rolls held that these costs had been properly disallowed, and that, under the Rules of the Supreme Court (Costs), 1875, ord. 7, r. 26, the master was bound to disallow them. He also held that when a party makes an objection in writing, under ord. 7, r. 30, to the allowance or disallowance of any item by a taxing master, he is only

bound to specify the items to which he objects, and need not state his reasons for objecting. *Ex parte Dillon, In re Woods* (28 W. R. 402, L. R. 13 Ch. D. 318), raised a question as to the right of a trustee in bankruptcy to disallow items in a bill of costs tendered by way of proof by a solicitor. It was argued that the solicitor was entitled, under 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, s. 37, to have his costs taxed in the ordinary way, but the Court of Appeal held that this enactment does not apply to a proof in bankruptcy; that a solicitor has no absolute right to insist upon his charges being referred to taxation, and that the registrar had power, with the assistance (if required) of the taxing-master, to determine the amount due. With reference to the particular items in dispute, the court held that charges by a solicitor for addressing and posting circulars were improper.

Two cases during the year involved questions as to setting off costs. In *Barker v. Hemming* (28 W. R. 764) the plaintiff had obtained judgment by default against the drawer and acceptor of a bill of exchange, and issued an execution against the goods of the former. The acceptor afterwards got the judgment set aside with costs, on the ground that his acceptance had been forged, and he also set up a claim to the goods seized in the execution against the drawer, and an interpleader issue was tried, in which judgment was ultimately entered against him, with costs. In taxing the defendant's costs in the action upon the bill of exchange, the master allowed the plaintiff to deduct the costs due to him from the defendant as the unsuccessful claimant in the interpleader issue. This decision was upheld by Lindley, J., and the defendant appealed to the Queen's Bench Division. It was urged by the plaintiff's counsel that the costs could be set off because they both arose out of the same matter—namely, the question of the ownership of the goods—but Cockburn, C.J., and Bowen, J., held that the two proceedings were distinct, and that the set-off should not have been allowed. This decision has been reviewed by the Court of Appeal (see 24 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 779), and reliance was placed by the appellant's counsel upon rule 19 of the Additional Rules as to Costs, 1875, but the court took the same view as the Queen's Bench Division. James, L.J., pointed out that the rule meant that the set-off must be not merely between two persons, but between two parties—i.e., parties to the same proceedings—whereas the interpleader was a distinct and collateral proceeding as to a matter which was not in question in the action itself, the identity of the parties to the respective proceedings being a mere accident. In *Ex parte Griffin, In re Adams* (28 W. R. 714, L. R. 14 Ch. D. 37), the question of setting off costs arose in a bankruptcy proceeding, and the Court of Appeal held that the Bankruptcy Court ought not to allow the costs of a proceeding in the High Court to be set off against costs in a bankruptcy. James, L.J., pointed out that, as was observed by Lord Eldon in *Hall v. Ody* (2 B. & P. 28), the allowance of such a set-off would have a tendency to prejudice the lien of the solicitor, who was the equitable owner of the costs.

At the Garstang Sessions on Thursday week, Mr. G. Dickson, solicitor, applied on behalf of the overseers of the Union for a warrant against Police-constable Lee, of the County Lancaster Constabulary, for the non-payment of 5s. 1d. for poor-rate due on the 29th of September last. Mr. C. H. Sadler, deputy-clerk of the peace for Lancashire appeared for the county police authorities, who denied the liability of the building, which was used for Crown purposes, to be rated. It was stated that the application was made by the overseers in consequence of the threat of the district auditor of the Local Government Board to surcharge. It was stated that the liability of the police to be thus rated would be determined by appeal. No warrant was granted pending the appeal, but Mr. Dickson said he would apply for a *mandamus*.

RECENT DECISIONS.

ASHWORTH v. MUNN, C.A., 28 W. R. 965.

The contention of the appellants in this case was founded on a tolerably obvious fallacy. Real estate belonging to a partnership is treated in equity as personalty as between the real and personal representatives of the partners. Why? Because the share of a partner is nothing more than his proportion of the partnership assets after they have been turned into money and applied in liquidation of the partnership debts. In other words, the right of the partner is not to a share of the land, but to a share of the proceeds of sale of the land. In *Ashworth v. Munn* it was contended that the share of a partner in real estate belonging to the partnership was to be considered as personal estate for all purposes, and not only as personal estate, but as pure personalty within the Charitable Uses Act (9 Geo. 2, c. 36). Now, it has long been settled that the proceeds of sale of real estate are not pure personalty within the Act, and it would seem that the decision of the Court of Appeal, that the share of a partner in land belonging to the partnership cannot be given by will to a charity, might have been rested on the footing that even if the share is personal estate it is such as being part of the proceeds of sale of land, and as such cannot be given to a charity except by the observance of the restrictions of the Charitable Uses Act. But this view is not referred to in the judgment, and probably either did not occur to the court, or was rejected on account of difficulties arising in reconciling it with the decision in *Myers v. Perigal* (3 D. M. & G. 599) as to shares in joint-stock companies. The court in *Ashworth v. Munn* based their judgment on the ground that the share of a deceased partner is "a charge affecting the land" within section 3 of the Charitable Uses Act. "Whatever," said James, L.J., "is due upon taking the partnership accounts is a direct charge upon the land." The practical point to be observed is that the share of a testator in partnership land cannot be given by will to a charitable use.

IN RE ARTHUR, ARTHUR v. WYNNE, M.R., 28 W. R. 972.

A difficult and interesting question was raised in this case. A man before his marriage, in 1873, covenanted with trustees to insure his life on or before July 2, 1875. Shortly before the latter date his life became uninsurable, and he died without having effected an insurance. In an action for the administration of his estate, the trustees claimed to rank as creditors against the estate for damages for breach of the covenant. Now, it is clear enough that if the covenant was to be construed as an absolute covenant to effect an insurance on or before a given day, it would be no answer to the claim for damages for breach of covenant to say that the covenantor could not possibly have effected the insurance during a short time before the date specified. He had nearly two years within which he might have effected it, and his representatives could not avail themselves of his neglect in order to escape liability on the covenant. But was the covenant absolute? Was it not subject to an implied condition that up to the date specified the life of the covenantor should continue to be an insurable life? Considering the absolute terms of the covenant, the nature of the contract, and what must have been the fair contemplation of the parties (namely, to insure a provision for the wife and children), the Master of the Rolls thought that there was no implied condition of the kind suggested. We confess, with great deference, that we should have thought that the continuing insurability of the covenantor's life was, to use the language of Blackburn, J., in *Taylor v. Caldwell* (11 W. R. 726, 3 B. & S. 826), contemplated by the parties, at the time of entering into the contract, as the very "foundation of what was to be done." It seems, as the damages were stated

to have been subsequently arranged between the parties, that there will be no appeal from the decision, and the point decided should be noticed by those who have to advise as to, or to prepare, settlements based on the common but troublesome method of provision for wife and children by insurance.

IN RE KNOWLES, ROOSE v. CHALK, V.C.M., 28 W. R. 975.

The first question here was whether the Act 11 Geo. 4, and 1 Will. 4, c. 40, affects the title of an executor, as against the Crown, to the undisposed-of residue of the testator's personal estate. There could not be much difficulty as to the answer. The Act, it will be remembered, by section 1, provides that when any person shall die, having by will or codicil appointed any executor, such executor shall be deemed by courts of equity to be a trustee for the person or persons (if any) who would be entitled to the estate under the Statute of Distributions, in respect of any residue not expressly disposed of, unless it shall appear by the will or any codicil thereto, that the person so appointed executor was intended to take such residue beneficially. But section 2 provides that nothing in the Act shall affect or prejudice any right which any executor, if the Act had not been passed, would have been entitled to, in cases where there is not any person who would be entitled to the testator's estate under the Statute of Distributions, in respect of any residue not expressly disposed of. The effect of this last section is clearly to retain the old law unaltered in cases where there are no next of kin, and so Vice-Chancellor Malins held. In this case, therefore, unless there is something in the will to show an intention to the contrary, the executors will, as against the Crown, take the property for their own benefit. But it was contended in the recent case that a direction in the will that the testatrix's debts and funeral expenses should be paid by her executors showed an intention to the contrary. It was urged that this direction was equivalent to an expression that the purpose of the appointment was "to see that my will is put in force," which words in *Braddon v. Farrand* (2 Russ. 87) were held to make the executors trustees. But Vice-Chancellor Malins rejected this rather far-fetched argument, and took occasion to express his disapproval of the decision in *Braddon v. Farrand*.

REVIEWS.

CHITTY'S STATUTES.

CHITTY'S COLLECTION OF STATUTES OF PRACTICAL UTILITY, ARRANGED IN ALPHABETICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER, WITH NOTES THEREON. THE FOURTH EDITION. By J. M. LELY, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. Henry Sweet; Stevens & Sons.

We are glad to be able to express strong approval of this new edition of Chitty. A glance at the pages will show the extent to which the convenience of the reader has been consulted in the mechanical arrangements of the book. The type used is larger than in the last edition; the heading of each page includes, besides the main catchword, subsidiary words indicating more accurately the subject of the Act given below; and in all cases the date of the Act is given in bold figures in the heading, and the year and chapter in the margin. This renders it easy for the practitioner to find the Act he is in search of by means of the headings of pages alone. Nor is this the only improvement which has been introduced. Each subject upon which several statutes are printed is prefaced with a list of the Acts and a statement of their general object, with a reference to the pages at which they are to be found. Cross-references are also given to other titles under which matter bearing upon the subject may be found.

In the more important and difficult matter of the se-

lection of the statutes to be printed, we think Mr. Lely has generally shown sound judgment. If he has erred at all, it is on the safe side of giving too many Acts. Thus he prints the Land Transfer Acts of 1862 and 1875, which can hardly be said to be referred to in ordinary practice, and in all probability, will not be alive a year hence. Still in face of the facts that Mr. Dart and his editor have thought these Acts worthy of a long summary, and that Mr. Prideaux has printed the Act of 1875 in full in the appendix to his *Precedents*, it would have been a bold measure to omit them from a collection of statutes. So far as our investigation has yet gone, we have not detected the omission of any statute of importance to the practitioner. With regard to the arrangement of the Acts, we are also generally well satisfied with the result of our examination of the book. It would, of course, be easy to find instances where it appears to us that the convenience of the reader could be better consulted by placing a particular statute under a different heading. We should, for instance, have placed 33 & 34 Vict. c. 44, "An Act to declare the stamp duty chargeable on certain leases," under the head of "Stamps"; or if this course was not adopted, we should have included under the head of "Leases," in addition to this Act, 39 Vict. c. 16, and the portions of the Stamp Act, 1870, relating exclusively to leases. And it would certainly have been more convenient if the editor had abolished Mr. Chitty's rather unmeaning heading of "Conveyances," and placed some of the matter under the familiar head of "Vendor and Purchaser." But considering the great difficulty which often arises in deciding as to the title under which a statute shall be placed, we think Mr. Lely may be congratulated on the generally successful way in which he has dealt with the matter.

The modern practice of legislation by orders places the editor of a book like that before us in considerable difficulty. If he prints all the orders, he swells his book with matter which practitioners have on their shelves in more handy volumes; if he omits all orders, he runs the risk of being charged with rendering his book imperfect. Mr. Lely has very properly omitted the Bankruptcy Rules and the County Court Rules, but he has printed the rules under a large number of other statutes, from the Debtors Act, 1869, to the Vaccination Act, 1874.

The notes are terse and practical; and where, as in the case of the Trustee Acts, they are numerous, the lengthy expanses of notes which are to be found in former editions are avoided by the use of a smaller type. A similar expedient would have been useful under "Charities," where the notes might also, with advantage, have been somewhat fuller.

If anyone thinks that the completion of the Revised Statutes has rendered Chitty unnecessary, he should turn to the heading "Land Tax" in the latter work, and compare the ease with which he can there find any provision he wants with the difficulty he experiences in hunting out the Acts through the volumes of the Revised Statutes, even with the aid of the Statute Index. The truth is that, independently of the fact that the Revised Statutes come down only to 1868, there will always be an opening for a collection of statutes classified according to subject. The practitioner has only to take down one of the compact volumes of Chitty, and he has at once before him all the legislation on the subject in hand. Only those who have frequently to consult the statutes can understand the full benefit thus conferred; but we imagine we have said enough to show that the remodelled Chitty deserves a place on the practising lawyer's shelves.

WATERS.

THE LAW RELATING TO WATERS, SEA, TIDAL, AND INLAND. By H. J. W. COULSON and U. A. FORBES, Barristers-at-Law. H. Sweet.

The authors of this volume have chosen a difficult

subject, but one on which they have the advantage of the labours of several eminent text-book writers. Some of the works of these writers, notably that by Mr. Phear, contain an unusual amount of that most rare of all qualities in a law work—original and careful thought. But it is twenty years since Mr. Phear's book was published, and, with all its great merits, we believe it was never very successful. It contains, we must admit, a good deal of ingenious twisting of cases to fit certain theories propounded by the author; too much argumentative inference from cases, and too little clear distinction between such inference and the positive law stated by the writer. If more care had been taken to point out to the reader (by means of quotations from, or references to, judgments) when the text was founded on the decisions of judges and when on the decisions of the learned author, the book would probably have met with greater success. The authors of the present work cannot be said to err in this way. Their references to authorities are copious, and their extracts from judgments numerous; while their speculations and criticisms are few and far between. They avow in their preface their intention to be to confine themselves, as far as possible, "to the decisions of the courts as expressed in the words of learned judges." If, however, their mode of dealing with their subject is unambitious, their conception of the subject is not so. They sweep into their net every topic connected with waters, including not only the sea, but also bridges, and tolls, and rates.

Perhaps the fairest mode of testing the mode of execution of the book will be to take an important recent case as to which the authors must have trusted wholly to their own judgment. The first decision we looked for was *Hurdman v. North-Eastern Railway Company* (26 W. R. 489, L. R. 3 C. P. D. 168), a case of no little interest on the difficult question of striking the balance of justice and expediency between the rights of adjoining land-owners. The case is accurately stated at page 133, and the extent of the principle is given in the words of Lord Justice Cotton. We do not understand, however, why the important statement in the judgment of the ground of the non-liability of an upper-mine owner for the flow of water to a lower mine should be relegated to a foot-note, instead of being added to the statement, on the next page, of *Wilson v. Waddell*. We do not think that ground is very satisfactory; but it ought, at all events, to be brought to the knowledge of the reader who consults the book for information as to mines; and it should, moreover, be stated as having been laid down in *Hurdman's case*, and not merely as the suggestion of the authors. The case of *Holker v. Porrit* (21 W. R. 414, 23 W. R. 400, L. R. 8 Ex. 115, 10 Ex. 59) seems to us to be inadequately stated and discussed; but it is hardly worth while to go fully into the subject here. The authors have evidently set before themselves a modest standard, and, if judged by this, they cannot be said to have been unsuccessful. It appears to us, from a perusal of a considerable part of the work, that the statement of the law is generally accurate. Considerable pains have evidently been bestowed on the book, and, although it has no pretensions to originality or scientific arrangement, it will be a useful compendium of the law on a difficult subject.

COMPANIES.

THE LAW AND PRACTICE OF JOINT STOCK AND OTHER COMPANIES, &c., &c. By Sir HENRY THRING, K.C.B. FOURTH EDITION. Edited by G. A. R. FITZGERALD, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons; H. Sweet; Maxwell & Sons.

As the draftsman of the Companies Act, 1862, Sir H. Thring was able to give to his book more authority than usually attaches to annotated editions of statutes. He constructed his work on the principle of, first of all, giving a treatise on the Law of Companies, and then printing the statutes, with notes to the sections. Both the

treatise and notes have always appeared to us to be excellent specimens of workmanship; and after the modifications and additions introduced in the last edition by Mr. Fitzgerald—especially the largely increased notes to the Acts—the work took its place as one of the standard text-books on Companies. Since the last edition was issued there have been passed the three Companies Acts of 1877, 1879, and 1880. These are printed in full, and are prefaced with notes explaining their cause and general object. These notes appear to us to be a very useful feature of the work; that on the Act of 1879 is exceedingly well done. There are also, of course, notes appended to the sections. The precedents in Appendix II., which are not the least useful part of the book, have been added to. We may, however, suggest as desirable the addition of object clauses and articles moulded with special reference to the very common case now-a-days of the turning of a private business into a limited company, in which the shares are to be held by a small number of persons, and the working of the company is as far as possible to resemble that of a private partnership.

THE JUDICATURE ACTS.

THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACTS AND THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION ACT, 1876, WITH RULES OF COURT AND FORMS, TO MAY, 1880, ANNOTATED SO AS TO FORM A MANUAL OF PRACTICE ADAPTED CHIEFLY TO THE CHANCERY AND COMMON LAW DIVISIONS. By R. W. ANDREWS, and A. B. STONEY, Barristers-at-Law. Reeves & Turner.

This is a compact and handy edition of the Acts and Rules; and as it includes all the rules, up to those published in May last (the latest issued except the order as to fees of search, &c., issued in September last), and has all the rules placed under their proper orders, the book will be well worth buying as a mere matter of convenience to the practitioner. But the work has other merits. The notes of cases appended to the sections and rules are very condensed, but so far as we have tested them they appear to be exceptionally intelligent and accurate. They are very seldom mere copies of head-notes, and often indicate that the authors have considered the cases cited with care.

LEGAL DIARY.

THE LAWYER'S COMPANION AND DIARY AND LONDON AND PROVINCIAL LAW DIRECTORY FOR 1881. Edited by JOHN THOMPSON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. Thirty-fifth Annual Issue. Stevens & Sons; Shaw & Sons.

This well-known Diary needs no commendation beyond the simple announcement of its publication. We have tested it by many years' use, and can testify that it is complete, accurate, and convenient.

In the Court of Appeal, on Tuesday, the Lord Chancellor and the Attorney-General paid a tribute of esteem to the late Lord Justice Thesiger. The Lord Chancellor said that the late Lord Justice "was advanced to this Court of Appeal at a very early age in comparison with the age at which men usually attain to distinction, and after a professional career, brilliant indeed, but comparatively short. In another man so rapid and so early an advancement might, perhaps, have provoked some envy, but with him it was attained with universal goodwill. While he sat on the bench he fully justified the discernment of those who advised the Crown to promote him, by his knowledge, by his learning, by his patience, by his industry, and by that unflinching modesty and dignity of demeanour which in him no circumstances could change. While he lived he did good work and well sustained the reputation of the bench while he sat here, and the public hoped that it would for many years have had the advantage of his wisdom and his virtue. These hopes have now been disappointed, and all that it remains for me to say is that we shall long deplore his loss, and shall ever affectionately regard his memory."

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LAW SOCIETY AND PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The suggestion that the profession or the Law Society should be represented in Parliament is one, I think, well entitled to consideration.

Mr. Keen's paper on the subject will no doubt shortly be circulated, with the account of the society's transactions at Sheffield, when his reasons in support of the suggestion can be more fully considered.

I have, however, been led to look into the society's last annual report to see how far it affords any information showing that the council really require the aid of a parliamentary representative. The report refers at some length to the amendment of the law of real property, with special reference to the papers read at the Cambridge meeting, and explains the course pursued by the council with regard thereto.

It appears that the council were frequently in communication with the Lord Chancellor upon the Bills which he introduced last February, respectively entitled the "Settled Lands Bill" and the "Conveyancing and Law of Property Bill." All the proposals of the council were considered and many were adopted.

In referring to the exertions made by the council, the report hopes that the influence thus exercised will serve to show that solicitors are not averse to the improvement and simplification of the law, though it may involve a curtailment of their pecuniary privileges. Now I cannot help feeling that, in considering the details of the Lord Chancellor's Bills, the council would have been materially assisted if they could have secured the constant attention of a member directly representing the interests of the profession in the House of Commons, and that the passage of the Bills would have been greatly facilitated if they had reached the Lower House, supposing they could have been authoritatively supported by such a member. Moreover, there are practical details connected with the amendment of the law of real property of the greatest importance to clients, with which solicitors only are competent effectually to deal.

Then, with regard to the remuneration of solicitors, which was another subject considered by the council, there are few questions of more practical importance both to solicitors and their clients. A member, therefore, addressing the House of Commons, even on this comparatively small topic, as the representative of the profession, could not fail to command attention and to contribute materially to the solution of this troublesome, and by no means easy, question. Somewhat similar remarks apply to the many other important matters with which the society's report shows the council had been dealing during the previous year. The space at your disposal necessarily prevents my referring to them in detail. Those, however, of your readers who care to pursue the matter further can consult the report and satisfy themselves upon the point. But I venture to submit that in the consideration of many of the matters from time to time deliberated upon by the council, the assistance of a parliamentary representative would prove of great value and materially promote the result which the council might desire to attain. In addition, I apprehend frequent references are made to the council by members outside the council, which, in order to be adequately disposed of, would probably render it necessary to put a question in the House of Commons.

At the present time there is no member by whom the council can require the requisite interrogatory to be put. Again, the Lord Chancellor, or the Attorney-General for the time being, may differ from the council as to the necessity for, or the contents of, a Bill. It may be that the council is right, and that the Lord Chancellor or the Attorney-General is wrong. Surely in order

to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion it would seem just for there to be some member officially to announce, and to enforce, the views of the council upon the particular point. I know of no body so much consulted as the council on matters affecting legislation. If it is right that all professions should possess a parliamentary representative, that is an additional reason, but very far from being the only reason, for accepting Mr. Keen's proposal. In all commissions affecting the administration of justice, or the amendment of the law in any particular upon which it is probable that a solicitor may be consulted, it is now almost the invariable rule to invite the president, or some other member of the council, to become a member of the commission.

I think there is great force in the remark of "One who was Present" that solicitors now in Parliament must, in the first place, consider their duty to their constituents. Mr. Whitley, the member for Liverpool, is no doubt quite willing to give to the council all the parliamentary assistance in his power. With, however, the duties of so large a constituency as Liverpool, which is so deeply interested in mercantile matters and legislation generally, it is not to be expected that Mr. Whitley, or, indeed, any solicitor in Parliament, can give the time and attention of which the council has probably often stood in need.

I confess that until Mr. Keen drew attention to the suggestion it had not occurred to me. It is certainly worthy of full consideration. If the profession should become entitled to be represented in Parliament, surely that candidate would be elected who should appear most fitted by his judgment, experience, knowledge, and ability, to command the attention of the House. He might be a Liberal-Conservative or a Conservative-Liberal; and although, in the event of a contest, politics would influence the result, yet no such member would stand the chance of being re-elected if he should prove a failure, no matter what might be his political views.

I repudiate entirely the idea that the adoption of the proposal would introduce into our ranks an element of political antagonism. The election would be quietly conducted in the same manner as the election of members for the Universities. Exertions would, of course, be made on behalf of opposing candidates by their supporters, after the same fashion, I suppose, as is now frequently done to secure the election of a particular member to the council. For my own part, I like to see exertions of this kind. They tend to show that the members of our profession are not so apathetic as they used certainly to be, and that they really take an interest in the election. It is because in times gone by we have been so wrapped up in our own individual and separate interests that we have sometimes failed to rise in the estimation of the public to the true dignity of the important position we occupy in the manifold duties of their daily life. Thanks to the efforts of the council, especially in recent years, and growing in importance every year, much has been accomplished. There yet remains ground to be covered which only our own apathy can prevent us from occupying.

There are, of course, objections which may be urged against Mr. Keen's proposal. I am by no means disposed at any time to arrive at a hasty conclusion. I should like, therefore, to hear from some of your correspondents, who may have given attention to the matter and have come to an unfavourable conclusion, what are the grounds upon which they think that Mr. Keen's proposal should not be adopted, or why, if right theoretically, it is nevertheless impracticable?

Lxx.

THE BRIGHTON MEETING.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—A discussion has arisen in several quarters as to the probable tax upon our Brighton friends incident to their generous offer to receive the Incorporated

Law Society in October next. Various proposals have been made, but I venture to think that the suggestion of a "purse," thrown out by me at Sheffield (which was immediately indorsed by a knot of acquaintances), has not been improved upon at present.

There is little doubt that an entertainment at London-super-Mare is likely to attract a large number of solicitors from all parts of England, especially in the month of October, when many of us visit Brighton almost as of course. It would not surprise me if the attendance far exceeds that at any of the other towns—perhaps, indeed, it will be greater than if the congress were held in London itself, making the tax upon the limited resources of Brighton obviously out of all proportion.

Of course, it may be said that our Sussex friends have calculated all this, and that it is beyond our province to intervene; but the circumstances are of a very exceptional character, and I do not think that Brighton would lose any of its dignity by accepting a contribution in a lump sum from London men. This need not interfere with the help from the Law Society on certain heads.

A large number of town solicitors would, I think, be willing to subscribe a guinea or more to a fund, whilst many would probably hesitate to pay a fixed price for a dinner ticket (even if Brighton would listen to such a suggestion, which I doubt), for this process would tend to destroy the sentiment of an "invitation" and create an awkward precedent. I know several men who would willingly form a committee if this proposal to start a subscription meets with any general approval.

FRANCIS K. MUNTON.

3, Lambeth-hill, Queen Victoria-street, Nov. 1, 1880.

P.S.—The foregoing was written before I had had an opportunity of reading the letters in your columns of the 23rd and 30th of October. Such letters, however, do not much touch my particular point, and I will only just add that I was the individual alluded to as having suggested to our friend Mr. Howlett (at the Chatsworth lunch) that he might expect a thousand visitors at Brighton, and I do not think I shall be far out in my reckoning.

F. K. M.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

LEAVE TO APPEAL OBTAINED BY PERSON NOT A PARTY TO ACTION.—In a case of *Markham v. Markham*, before the Court of Appeal on the 2nd inst., the question arose how leave to appeal from an order was to be obtained by a person who was interested in the subject-matter of an action, but who was not a party to it. The action was an administration one, and an order had been made on further consideration declaring that the residuary estate of the testator was, on the true construction of his will, divisible among such of his brothers and sisters and the brothers and sisters of his wife as had survived the wife, and such of the children as had survived the wife of such brothers and sisters of the testator and the brothers and sisters of the wife as were living at the date of the will, and had subsequently died in the lifetime of the testator, or in the lifetime of the wife. One of the sisters of the widow had died before the widow, leaving one child, who had also died before the widow. This child claimed to be entitled under the will to a share of the testator's residue; and he had made an assignment of his interest. The assignee was not a party to the action, and had not been served with notice of the decree, and upon the hearing on further consideration he was in no way represented. He desired to appeal from the order on further consideration, and he applied by motion *ex parte* to the Court of Appeal for leave to appeal. It was urged on his behalf that under the old practice in the Court of Chancery, as shown by the case of *Parmiter v. Parmiter* (2 D. F. & J. 526), leave to appeal in such a case would have been obtained by an *ex parte* petition or motion in the Court of Appeal, and that, inasmuch as no provision on the subject is contained in the Judicature Acts or rules, the old practice still remains. The Court (Lord SELBORNE, C., and BRETT and COTTON, L.JJ.) acceded to this view, and gave leave to appeal upon production to the registrar of an affidavit of the title of the

applicant to the interest of the deceased child.—SOLICITORS, Duncan, Warren, & Gardner.

TIME FOR APPEALING—POWER OF ADMINISTRATOR TO SELL REAL ESTATE.—In a case of *In re Clay and Tuttle*, before the Court of Appeal on the 3rd inst., the question was raised whether an appeal had been brought in time. A summons under the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874, was taken out by a vendor asking that the purchaser's requisitions and objections in respect of the title to the property contracted to be sold had been sufficiently answered by the vendor, and that a good title had been shown in accordance with the contract. On the hearing of this summons, Hall, V.C., made an order that "this court, being of opinion that a good title has not been shown to the said hereditaments, do not think fit to make any order on the said application, but doth order that the applicant do pay" the purchaser's cost of the application. This order was pronounced on the 26th of June. Notice of appeal by the vendor was served on the purchaser on the 17th of July (a Saturday), but not till after two p.m. The purchaser took the objection that the appeal was too late. The court (JESSEL, M.R., and JAMES and COTTON, L.JJ.) held that the order contained in substance a declaration of the right of the parties, and that consequently it was not a simple refusal, and the time for appealing did not run from the date of the pronouncing of the order, but from the date of its completion. JESSEL, M.R., said that whenever an order contained a declaration as such, or as an expression of the opinion of the court, so as to bind the rights of the parties, it did not amount to a simple refusal so as to compel the bringing of an appeal within twenty-one days from the date of the pronouncing of the order. On the merits of the case, the question was whether an administrator *cum testamento annexo* could sell real estate of the testator for the purpose of paying his debts, the personal estate being insufficient. The testator by his will directed that his debts should be paid by his executors thereinafter named, and, in case his personal estate was insufficient for that purpose, then he charged his real estate with the payment of the deficiency. He then made beneficial devise and bequests of his real and personal estate, and appointed two persons executors. After his death the persons named as executors renounced probate, and letter of administration, with the will annexed, were granted to the testator's widow. The personal estate was insufficient to pay the testator's debts, and the administratrix entered into a contract to sell a part of the real estate. The purchaser objected that the administratrix had no implied power under the will to sell the real estate, either independently of the provisions of section 16 of the Act 22 & 23 Vict. c. 35, or by virtue of those provisions. Hall, V.C. held that the objection was well founded, and the Court of Appeal (JESSEL, M.R., and JAMES and COTTON, L.JJ.) affirmed the decision. JESSEL, M.R., said that a power to sell the real estate of a testator for payment of his debts was implied in executors, because they were appointed by the will to pay the debts. They were the nominees of the testator, and if his personal estate was insufficient to pay his debts, they had an implied power to sell his real estate. But there was no authority showing that the court had ever implied such a power in an administrator who was not appointed by the testator but was an officer of the Probate Court. The testator could not be supposed to have anticipated that his executors would renounce probate. It would not be right that the court should now for the first time imply such a power in the officer of the court. And, as to section 16 of the Act, it was carefully framed so as to confine the power given by it to executors and persons on whom the executorship should devolve. It was impossible to suppose that the Legislature had forgotten that there were such persons as administrators, and there was no ground for giving to the words of the section any meaning but their natural one.—SOLICITORS, Dubois & Reid; Gard, Corbin, & Hall.

ALTERATION OF ORDER WHEN PASSED AND ENTERED—LEAVE TO MOVE FOR DISCHARGE OF WINDING-UP ORDER—FORM OF ORDER.—In a case of *Re Flagstaff Silver Mining Company of Utah (Limited)*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 2nd inst., a motion was made by a creditor of the

company to stay the drawing up of an order made by Pollock, B., sitting as Vacation Judge, on September 8, which discharged, as alleged, a previous order of the Master of the Rolls for the winding up of the company, made on the 24th of July, and that the carriage of such last-mentioned order might be given to the applicant. The facts were as follows:—It appeared that three petitions were presented to the Master of the Rolls to wind up the company by Metz, Hill, and Sadler. On the 24th of July a winding-up order was made on Metz and Hill's petitions, but an arrangement was made giving liberty to the company to move to discharge the order if the two petitioners were settled with within a week. On the 31st of July, the two petitioners having been paid, a motion was made to discharge the winding-up order, and the Master of the Rolls then discharged the winding-up order in Metz and Hill's petitions, but made a winding-up order on Sadler's petition, giving leave to the company to move to discharge such order in payment before the Vacation Judge. It appeared that on the 31st of July, notwithstanding notice by the company that they intended to pay off Metz and Hill's petitions, a winding-up order on these two petitions was passed and entered, the order being in the usual form, and without reserving any liberty to the company to discharge the order within a week. When the application to the Master of the Rolls on the 31st of July was made, the company did not know that the order had been passed and entered. On the 8th of September, on the *ex parte* application of the company in pursuance of the liberty reserved, and as Sadler's debt had been paid, Pollock, B., discharged the winding-up order of the 31st of July. On the 29th of September a creditor of the company moved to stay the drawing up of Pollock B.'s order, and after some discussion, it was arranged that the motion should stand to the 2nd of November, without prejudice to any question; things in the meantime to remain in *status quo*, and the order of the 8th of September not to be drawn up. The creditor had filed an affidavit in the application, in which he stated he was informed and believed that the Master of the Rolls had directed the drawing up of the order to be suspended for a week, to enable the company to pay off the petitioners, but that as the company had not done so, the order had been passed and entered, and that on the 8th of September an application was made to Pollock, B., to discharge the order of the 24th of July, on the ground that the company had paid off the petitioner's debts, and that there being no opposition, the judge had discharged the order of the Master of the Rolls. The applicant also submitted that the payment by the company of Sadler's debt after the winding-up order was improper, and that the winding-up order operated in favour of all the creditors. The applicant, therefore, asked to have the conduct of the winding-up order given to him. JESSEL, M.R., in refusing the motion, did not call upon the company's counsel, and said the costs must follow the event. He said that he had granted leave to the company, the sole respondents in Metz and Hill's petitions, to move to discharge the order made on payment of their respective debts with costs within a week, and such orders he frequently made. The order, therefore, of the 24th of July ought either not to have been drawn up for a week, or if drawn up within the week should have contained a reservation of the liberty to move to discharge it. The order had, however, been passed and entered by the petitioners' solicitor on the 31st of July, and this must have been through some misapprehension, as on the 31st of July the order of the 24th of July was discharged, and there was an end of the whole matter, except that there was another petition on which an order was made on the 31st of July, but leave to discharge that order before the Vacation Judge had again been given by him. That petitioner was also paid, and the winding-up order of the 31st of July was quite properly discharged by Mr. Baron Pollock. Another creditor, however, discovered that the winding-up order had been passed and entered, and then assumed erroneously that such order had been discharged by Mr. Baron Pollock without any jurisdiction to do so. It appeared to him that the applicant must take the consequences of the mistake he had made, as he might very easily have gone to the company's solicitor and ascertained the facts as to the several orders. No solicitor should assume that a judge would discharge the final order of another judge without jurisdiction, and it certainly did appear as if the creditor

had assumed all this. Unless there had been the leave reserved, the only court that could have discharged his order would have been the Appeal Court, and he, of course, could have similarly no jurisdiction to discharge the order of Mr. Baron Pollock. The result was that even if the applicant had any merits, which he had not, the order of Mr. Baron Pollock could only have been discharged by the Appeal Court. If his order of the 24th of July were wrong, it could have been corrected under ord. 59, r. 2, of April, 1880, and the creditor had not chosen to inquire, or he would have seen what a slight error had been made. The motion must, therefore, be dismissed with costs.—*SOLICITORS, Snell & Greentop; A. Kirby.*

CASES BEFORE THE BANKRUPTCY REGISTRARS.*

BEFORE MR. REGISTRAR MURRAY.

Nov. 3.—*Re Davis.*

Receiver appointed and injunction granted under petition for liquidation, although the debtor's stock-in-trade does not exceed £15 in value.

This was an application for the appointment of a receiver, and for an injunction to restrain an action brought by Frederick Smith, one of the creditors.

W. G. Whitmarsh (solicitor) for the debtor.

The debtor, Thomas Davis, had presented a petition for liquidation by arrangement or composition under sections 125 and 126 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869. He carried on the business of an oilman, and he estimated his debts to be £170, with assets consisting of stock-in-trade of the estimated value of £15, and the lease of the premises, 6, Wharf-road, Stratford, held by him for the unexpired term of nineteen years at the annual rental of £15. The affidavit filed in support of the application showed that the debtor was being sued by Frederick Smith, a creditor for £26, in one of the county courts, and judgment would be due in the action on the 6th inst.

MR. REGISTRAR MURRAY.—The debtor states his stock-in-trade to be of the value of £15 only, but in the present state of the law you are entitled to the appointment of a receiver and to an injunction.

Application granted.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON CLEGG, solicitor, of Sheffield, has been elected an Alderman for that borough. Mr Clegg was admitted a solicitor in 1868.

MR. ALFRED DRAKE BROCKMAN, solicitor and notary, of Folkestone, has been elected Clerk to the Sandgate Local Board. Mr Brockman was admitted a solicitor in 1873.

MR. CHARLES DICKINSON FIELD, barrister, LL.D., has been appointed a Judge of the High Court of Judicature at Calcutta, in succession to Sir Lewis Stewart Jackson, resigned. Mr. Justice Field is an LL.D. of Trinity College, Dublin, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1870. He has been a member of the Bengal Civil Service since 1860, and he is a member of the Legislative Council of Bengal.

MR. JOSEPH BOTTOMLEY FIRTH, barrister, M.P., has been appointed Junior Prosecuting Counsel to the Post-office on the North-Eastern Circuit, in succession to Mr. William Thomas Greenhow, who has been appointed a judge of county courts. Mr. Firth was born in 1842, and he is an LL.B. of the University of London. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1866, and he was elected M.P. for Chelsea in the Liberal interest at the late general election.

MR. HENRY ANDRADE HARBEN, barrister, has been elected a Member of the Metropolitan Board of Works, as a representative of the vestry of the parish of Hampstead. Mr. Harben was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1871, and he is a member of the South-Eastern Circuit.

MR. WILLIAM EDWARD LAW, solicitor, of Barnstaple, has

been appointed Clerk to the Magistrates for the Braunton Division of Devonshire, on the resignation of his father, Mr. Thomas Hooper Law. Mr. W. E. Law was admitted a solicitor in 1858, and he is clerk to the Barnstaple School Board.

THE RIGHT HON. SIR ROBERT LUSH, knight, senior puisne judge of the Queen's Bench Division, has been appointed a Judge of the Court of Appeal, in succession to the late Lord Justice Thesiger. Lord Justice Lush is the son of the late Mr. Robert Lush, of Shaftesbury, and he was born in 1847. He was called to the bar at Gray's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1840, and practised on the Home Circuit. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1857, and in 1865 succeeded the late Mr. Justice Crompton as a puisne judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, and received the honour of knighthood. He is the author of a treatise on "Queen's Bench Practice" and of some minor legal publications. He was a member of the Judicature Commission and of the Royal Commission on the Criminal Code Bill. The Lord Justice is a bencher of Gray's-inn, and was sworn a member of the Privy Council about a year ago.

MR. ETIENNE PELLEREAU, barrister, has been appointed Substitute-Procurer and Advocate-General for the Colony of Mauritius. Mr. PellerEAU was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1860.

MR. EDWARD HATWARD PERRIN, solicitor, of Temple Cloud, has been appointed Registrar of the Temple Cloud County Court (Circuit No. 52), in succession to Mr. John Rees Mogg, resigned. Mr. Perrin had acted for some time as deputy-registrar. He was admitted a solicitor in 1882, and is also clerk to the Clifton Board of Guardians, Assessment Committee, and Highway Board, and superintendent registrar.

MR. JAMES PRENDERGAST, Chief Justice of New Zealand, has been appointed to administer the Government of that colony, until the arrival of the new Governor, Sir Arthur Gordon. The Chief Justice is the son of the late Mr. Michael Prendergast, Q.C., recorder of Norwich and judge of the Sheriffs' Court of the City of London. He was educated at St. Paul's School and at Queen's College, Cambridge, and he was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Easter Term, 1856. He was for several years Attorney-General of New Zealand, and was appointed Chief Justice of the colony in 1875.

MR. JOSEPH HAWORTH REDMAN, barrister, has been appointed Recorder of the Borough of Ludlow, in succession to the late Mr. George Browne, Q.C. Mr. Redman was called to the bar in Hilary Term, 1870, and practised on the Oxford Circuit, and at the Staffordshire and Shropshire Sessions.

MR. MATTHEW WEBB, solicitor, of Barbican-chambers, Barbican, has been appointed Solicitor to the Parish of St. Botolph, Aldersgate. Mr. Webb was admitted a solicitor in 1876.

MR. WATKIN WILLIAMS, Q.C., M.P., has been appointed a Judge of the Queen's Bench Division, in succession to Lord Justice Lush. Mr. Justice Williams is the son of the Rev. Peter Williams, rector of Llansannan, Denbighshire. He was born in 1828, and studied for the medical profession, but afterwards entered at the Inner Temple, where he was called to the bar in Michaelmas Term, 1854. He is a member of the South-Eastern Circuit. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1873. He was M.P. for the Denbigh Boroughs in the Liberal interest from 1868 till the general election of the present year, when he was returned for Carnarvonshire. Mr. Justice Williams is a magistrate for Denbighshire, and a bencher of the Inner Temple. He is married to a daughter of Lord Justice Lush.

1,745 Newspapers recommend Macniven & Cameron's Pens. "They are without doubt the best pens invented."—*Argus.*

"They come as a boon and a blessing to men."

"The Pickwick, the Owl, and the Waverley Pen."

Also the *Blindfold Pens*, Nos. 1, 2, and 3, diagonal points. *Specially Commended for Solicitors, Attorneys, and Accountants' Offices.*—"The finest Pens we ever used."—*Public Opinion.* 6d. and 1s. per box, at all Stationers. Sample box (all the kinds) by post 1s. 1d. Patentees of Pens and Penholders. MACNIVEN & CAMERON, 23 to 25, Blair-street, Edinburgh, Penmakers to Her Majesty's Government Offices. (Established 1770.)—[ADVT.]

* Reported by J. C. BROUGH, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

COMPANIES.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

EDGE AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 23, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on Nov 6. *Fraser, Moorgate st, solicitor for the petitioners*

OSBORNE, HIGGINS, AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 27, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on Nov 6. *Clarke and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Trecedale and Co, Oldham, solicitors for the petitioners*

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE TOILET CLINIC, LIMITED.—The Vacation Judge has, by an order dated Oct 13, appointed William Williams, King st, Chesham, to be official liquidator

[Gazette, Oct 29.]

CHEMICAL AND AMMONIACAL LIQUOR COMPANY, LIMITED.—The M.R. has, by an order dated July 10, appointed Thomas Adams, Cambridge st, Birmingham, to be official liquidator

GREAT EASTERN GLACIARIUM COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Feb 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to Henry Spain, Gresham bldgs. Feb 17 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

MAYPOLE BATH HOTEL COMPANY, LIMITED.—The M.R. has fixed Nov 12 at 12, at his chambers, as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator

NEWBRIDGE RIVONDA COLLEMBIES COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 25, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on Nov 12. *Crowder and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Dalton and Co, Cardiff, solicitors for the petitioners*

PALATIN HOTEL AND RESTAURANT COMPANY, LIMITED.—Lord Coleridge, has, by an order dated Oct 6, appointed Thomas Sutton, Cooper st, Manchester, to be official liquidator

[Gazette, Nov. 2.]

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

GREAT BRITAIN MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 29, directed to be heard before the M.R., on Nov 13. *Lougerot and Myers, Clement's inn, solicitors for the petitioner*

[Gazette, Nov. 2.]

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

MANCHESTER AND COUNTY INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by the V.C. dated Oct 30, it was ordered that the above company be wound up

[Gazette, Nov 2.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

BURNHAM FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Crown Inn, Burnham, Somerset, Oct 27

[Gazette, Oct. 29.]

OBITUARY.

MR. ACTON TINDAL.

Mr. Acton Tindal, solicitor (of the firm of Tindal & Baynes), clerk of the peace for Buckinghamshire, died at the Manor House, Aylesbury, on the 27th ult. Mr. Tindal was the son of Mr. Thomas Tindal, solicitor, of Aylesbury, and was a nephew of Lord Chief Justice Sir Nicholas Tindal. He was born in 1811, and was educated at the Charterhouse. He was admitted a solicitor in 1834, and had ever since practised at Aylesbury. He was formerly in partnership with his father, and more recently with Mr. Edward Robert Baynes, who is clerk to the Lieutenancy for Buckinghamshire, and to the Commissioners of Income, Land, and Assessed Taxes for the Hundred of Ashendon. In 1838 he succeeded his father as clerk of the peace for Buckinghamshire, and he held that office until his death. He was also clerk to the county magistrates at Aylesbury, and registrar of the Archdeaconry of Buckinghamshire. Mr. Tindal was a perpetual commissioner for Buckinghamshire, and had filled the office of under-sheriff for the county. He took an active part in local business, having been for many years chairman of the Aylesbury Board of Guardians. He was also a member of the local board, and churchwarden of St. Mary's Parish. He was an active supporter of the Liberal party in the county and borough. Mr. Tindal was lord of the manor of Aylesbury. He was married to the only daughter of the Rev. John Harrison, vicar of Dinton, Buckinghamshire. He became a widower about a year ago, and leaves three sons and one daughter.

MR. WILLIAM TODD.

Mr. William Todd, solicitor and notary, of Hartlepool, died at Preston-on-Tees on the 19th ult. Mr. Todd was born in 1830, and was admitted a solicitor in 1855, and had an extensive business in the town and neighbourhood of Hartlepool. He was originally in partnership with Mr. Edward Hodgson, but more recently he had practised alone. He was a notary public, and had been for many years clerk and solicitor to the Trustees of Smith's Charity. Mr. Todd took an active part in municipal business, having been for a long time a member of the Hartlepool Town Council. He was recently placed in the commission of the peace for the borough. He actively supported the local Conservative party, and was a leading member of the South Durham and North Yorkshire Law Society, having been president of that body in 1878. Mr. Todd was buried at Hart Church on the 23rd ult.

MR. ROGER MONTGOMERIE.

Mr. Roger Montgomerie, advocate, deputy clerk register for Scotland, died of typhoid fever on the 25th ult. Mr. Montgomerie was the third son of Mr. William Eglington Montgomerie, of Annick Lodge, Ayrshire, and was born in 1828. He was educated at Rugby and at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1851, and M.A. in 1854, and he was admitted a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland in 1852. He was an advocate depute from February, 1858, till June, 1859, from June, 1866, till December, 1868, and a third time from February, 1874, till March, 1880. In 1868 he contested North Ayrshire in the Conservative interest, but he was defeated by Mr. William Finnie by a small majority. He was again a candidate in 1874, when he defeated Mr. Finnie by more than 200 votes. He retired from Parliament at the recent dissolution, and just before the change of Government he was appointed deputy clerk register for Scotland. Mr. Montgomerie was for several years a captain in the City of Edinburgh Rifle Volunteers, and he was a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for Ayrshire.

MR. EDWARD HENRY SELFE.

Mr. EDWARD HENRY SELFE, barrister, died very suddenly at Trentham, Staffordshire, on the 17th ult. Mr. Selfe was the eldest son of Mr. Henry Selfe Selfe, many years a metropolitan police magistrate, his mother being a daughter of the late Von. William Spooner, archdeacon of Coventry. He was born in 1843, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated third class in law and modern history in 1868. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1868, and practised on the Oxford Circuit, and at the Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, Wolverhampton, and Walsall Sessions. He had a good criminal business at circuit and sessions, and sat for some time as a county court judge in Staffordshire, as deputy for his uncle, the late Mr. William Spooner. Mr. Spooner had received several briefs for the Worcestershire Sessions, which were held two days after his death. The melancholy news occasioned great sorrow among the members of the bar, and Mr. George Woodvatt Hastings, M.P., the chairman of the court, expressed his regret at Mr. Selfe's death, and his sense of his high personal and professional character. The younger brother of the deceased, Mr. William Lucius Selfe, was principal secretary to Lord Cairns, when Lord Chancellor.

MR. CHARLES WOOLDRIDGE.

Mr. Charles Wooldridge, solicitor, notary, and proctor, of Winchester, died on the 18th ult. in his eighty-second year. Mr. Wooldridge was the son of Mr. Charles Wooldridge, solicitor. He was born in 1798, and was admitted a solicitor in 1822, and had practised for nearly sixty years at Winchester. He was formerly in partnership with his father, whom he succeeded nearly forty years ago in the office of deputy-registrar of the diocese of Winchester, and more recently he had been associated with his son, Mr. Charles Wooldridge, junior, who was admitted a solicitor in 1854. He was a notary public, clerk to the Winchester Turnpike Trust, deputy-registrar of the Winchester Consistory Court, registrar of the hospital of St. Cross, and

solicitor to the Winchester Gas and Water Companies. He was also for many years clerk to the Commissioners of Land, Assessed, and Property Taxes, which office is now held by his son. Mr. Wooldridge twice served the office of mayor of Winchester, and he was one of the magistrates for that city.

SOCIETIES.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

At the usual monthly meeting of the directors, held at the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, the 4th of November, the following being present:—viz., Mr. Desborough, chairman; Messrs. Tylee, L. Desborough, junr., E. J. Bristow, Williamson, Sidney Smith, Drew, Styan, and A. B. Carpenter, secretary, a grant of £50 was made to the daughter of a member and £20 to two non-members, and the ordinary general business was transacted.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

MICHAELMAS EXAMINATION, 1880.

GENERAL EXAMINATION OF STUDENTS OF THE INNS OF COURT, held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 18th, 19th, 20th, and 21st of October, 1880.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to the following students certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public examination:—James Edward Aldous, Archibald Bence Bence-Jones, Herbert Francis Blaine, Moses Nathaniel Bothamley, John Brooks, John Mainwaring Brown, Edward Palmer Chapman, William Owens Clark, Arthur Joseph Coppinger, Arthur Denman, Elias Fritzes De Vries, Edmund Charles Tennyson D'Eyncourt, Hugh James Gillispie, Thomas Arnold Christian Hampson, Edward William Hansell, George Edward Hermon, Frederick Gage Heygate, Edward Windsor Hussey, William Price James, Reginald Jones, Joseph Lewis Arnold Lamy, Robert Murray Lawes, Frederick John Lewis, Henry Gordon Mackenzie, Robert Furze McMillan, Herbert Picton Morris, John Philip Munster, Joakim Nicholas Pogose, Arthur Pierre Poley, Jiju Sanjo, Montague Shearman, James Sidebottom, Thomas Keay Tapling, William Whitaker Thompson, Arthur Horatio Todd, and Stanley John Weyman, of the Inner Temple; Ramsay Douglas Broadfoot, William Burd, Samuel Walter Cearn, Malcolm Percy Douglas, Arthur Travers Fawcett, Lionel Goodrich, Willie Grant, Bernard Batigan Hackney, Nathaniel Joseph Highmore, Arthur Gwynne James, and William James Waugh, of the Middle Temple; William Henry Denys Aston-Lewis, Walter Mew Barnes, Edward Cotton, Louis Jessemy de Souza-Leal-Aranha, William Dunn Gainsford, Courtney Stanhope Kenny, Alfred Pain, Robert Forsyth Scott, Martin Charles Sharp, Alfred John Simpson, and James Parker Smith, of Lincoln's-inn; Frederick Brian De Malbasse Gibbons, and Edward Robinson, of Gray's-inn, Esq.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Roman law:—Arthur Anthony Baumann, Edgar Brierley, Leonard Syer Bristowe, Herbert Montagu Broughton, Reynold Coleridge, Charles Henry Cook, Gerald Hardwicke Cowie, Richard Dawson, Edwin Arthur Dillon, Frederick William Dillon, Alfred Doran, John Draper, Nanda Lal Ghosh, Robert Darley Guinness, Charles Gipps Hamilton, Alfred Hayes, Richard Henderson, Samuel Edgar Hirst, Walter Moore Hodgkinson, Rivers Ker, Clement Hemery London, Hugh Martin Charles Macpherson, Robert Parr, James Worsley Pennymann, Leonard Marlborough Powell, Alexander Pulling, David Macdonald Robertson-Macdonald, Henry Medlicott Embell, Arthur Lowelya Saxon, Henry Pigot Ireland Warburton, Frederick Samuel White-White, and Walter Augustus Wigram, of the Inner Temple; Edmund Nicholas Alpe, Thomas Anderson, Nasarvanji Framji Bhandara, George Manchester Cohen, John Robert Duff, William Henry Field, John Alfred Foster, Robert Charles

Heron-Maxwell, William Gouldsmith Hunt, Alan Kerr, Stampa Walter Lambert, Charles Logan, William Bernard Megson, Robert Ernie Partridge, Radhikaram Phookan, and Thomas Mott Whitehouse, of the Middle Temple; Walter Bairstow, John Labouchere Beattie, Benjamin Francis Conn Costelloe, Samuel Theophilus Genu Downing, Francis Henry Launcelot Errington, Henry Percy Harris, Edward Cecil Christie Henry, Spencer Langton Holland, Benedict Jones, Thomas Rees Jones, George Paul Macdonell, Mortimer Drewe Malleon, William Moore, Charles Henry Sargant, and Reginald Winslow, of Lincoln's-inn; and Robert Weir Brown, of Gray's-inn, Esq.

By order of the council,

(Signed)

S. H. WALPOLE, Chairman

Council Chamber, Lincoln's-inn, Nov 1.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

The weekly meeting of this society was held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, on Tuesday evening last, Mr. Chas. Edward Barry in the chair. The question appointed for the evening's discussion was the following:—"A landlord insures his premises against fire in office A., and his tenant insures them in B. Both policies contain the usual clause as to division of loss with the other insuring company (if any). The premises are damaged by fire to the extent of £100. The tenant accepts from office B. £60 in respect of the damage, and signs a receipt stating that the premises are insured in no other office. He does not, however, repair the premises. Can the landlord recover from office A. the full amount of the damage before compelling his tenant to repair under a covenant for that purpose in his lease?" and was opened in the affirmative by Mr. Kirk. The following gentlemen then addressed the society: Messrs. F. D. Williams, E. G. Spiers, Green, Evans, and Tones; Mr. Kirk having replied, the question was decided in the affirmative by a majority of eight votes. The following cases amongst others were cited:—*North British, &c., Insurance Company v. Liverpool and London, &c., Insurance Company* (L. R. 5 Ch. D. 569); *Leeds v. Cheetham* (1 Sim. 146).

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Wednesday, the 3rd inst., at Clement's-inn, Mr. Dowson in the chair. After the conclusion of the private business the subject of debate, "That the preference accorded to classical, as compared with scientific, studies at our schools and universities, is opposed to the necessities of modern civilization," was opened by Mr. Spence, who was supported by Messrs. Bartrum, Spokes, Harvey, and MacLaren; and opposed by Messrs. Acland, Fry, Jackson, Jenks, and Collyer. The hon. opener replied, and upon a division the motion was lost by a majority of two votes.

A meeting of this society will be held on Monday evening, Nov. 8, at the Law Institution, for the purpose of discussing the construction put upon the Partition Act of 1868 by the House of Lords in the case of *Pitt v. Jones* (5 App. Cas. 661).

The *American Jurist* gives the following as the form of the advocate's oath prescribed by law, adopted many years ago by the representative council of Geneva: "I swear before God to be faithful to the Republic and Canton of Geneva; never to swerve from the respect due to the tribunals and to the authorities; not to advise or maintain any cause which does not appear to me to be just or equitable, unless in the defence of an accused; not to employ knowingly, in order to maintain the causes which shall be confided to me, any means contrary to the truth, and not to attempt to deceive the judges by any artifice, or by any false exposition of facts or of law; to abstain from all offensive personality, and not to advance any fact against the honour and the reputation of the parties, unless it be indispensable to the cause with which I shall be charged; not to encourage the commencement or the carrying on of any process from any motive of passion or of interest; and not to refuse from any personal considerations the cause of the feeble, the stranger, or the oppressed."

CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.
LAST DAY OF PROOF.

COOKE, HENRY, Kidderminster, Innkeeper. Nov 30. Cooke v Crowther, M.R. Talbot, Kidderminster
CROOK, JOSEPH, Waddesdon, Bucks, Farmer. Nov 30. Rogers v Rose, V.C. Bacon. Horwood, Aylesbury
EYERSFIELD, HENRY, Gravesend, Wharfinger. Nov 30. Mills v Dennis, M.R. Bewley, Gravesend
GRAVES, ALBERT REGINALD, Charlton House, Wilts. Nov 30. Graves v Graves, V.C. Malins. Martineau, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn
HAMES, HENRY, Llanidloes, Montgomery, Innkeeper. Nov 30. Jones v Hamer, V.C. Hall. Jenkins and Davies, Llanidloes
KERN, CHARLES, Empingham, Rutland, Farmer. Nov 27. Canner v Keon, V.C. Malins. Law, Stamford
MORGAN, FRANCIS, Wellington, Salop, Grocer. Nov 30. Griffiths v Morgan, V.C. Malins. Taylor, Newtown
WATKINS, SAMUEL, Harden, York, Stuff Manufacturer. Dec 1. Crabtree v Watmuff, V.C. Bacon. Mossman and Haley, Bradford
WILLIAMS, ELLER PARRY, Exmouth, Dec 10. Williams v Knott, V.C. Hall. Hall, Gray's inn sq
[Gazette, Nov. 2.]

CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 25.
LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

AUDLEY, WILLIAM, Cambridge, Gasfitter. Dec 31. Ellison and Co, Cambridge
BAMFORD, THOMAS, The Shrubbery, Highbury hill, Esq. Dec 20. Shephard and Sons, Finsbury circus
BRAUTYER, HIPPOLYTE, JOSEPH MAURICE DE BARREUL. Dec 8. Brabant, Gray's inn sq
BURGESS, DAVID, Cambridge, Furniture Dealer. Dec 31. Ellison and Co, Cambridge
COOPER, GEORGE, Norton, Derby, Quarryman. Nov 30. Parker and Brailsford, Sheffield
COTTINGHAM, JOHN, Kingston upon Hull, Fish Curer. Dec 1. Roberts and Leak, Hull
COWLEY, CHARLES, Preston, Sussex, Farmer. Dec 14. Woods and Dempster, Brighton
DENISON, ARTHUR, South Norwood, Surrey, Victualler. Nov 15. Plunkett and Leader, St. Paul's churchyard
DOBBINGTON, MARY ANN, Milton rd, Romford, Essex. Jan 31. Taylor and Jaquet, South st, Finsbury sq
FITZPATRICK, MARY, Worksop, Nottingham. Dec 1. Coulson-Worksop
HALL, WILLIAM, Nottingham, Hat Manufacturer. Jan 1. Smith and Mammatt, Ashby-de-la-Zouch
HARVEY, HENRY, Barrington rd, Brighton, Gent. Dec 14. Ravenscroft and Co, John st, Bedford row
HILL, THOMAS, Beaulieu, Southampton. Nov 15. Coxwell and Co, Southampton
HUGHES, EMILY MARY ANN, Robert st, Fulham rd. Dec 6. Poole and Hughes, Chancery lane
HUGHES, MARY, St. Asaphs, Flint. Dec 1. Sisson and George, St. Asaphs
JONES, ESTHER, Abbey terrace, Llandilofawr, Carmarthen. Nov 13. Davies and Co, Haverfordwest
KERR, WILLIAM PATERSON, Hillside, Willesden, Auctioneer. Dec 7. Harley and Co, Finsbury circus
LONDON, JOHN WITTICOMBS READY, Braintree, Devon, Clerk in Holy Orders. Dec 1. Chanter and Co, Barnstaple
LEITCH, DUNSTON JOHN, Witley, Surrey, Gent. Dec 24. Mellersh, Godalming
LOMAX, SAMUEL, Horsecroft, Whitworth, Lancaster, Labourer. Dec 1. Jackson, Rochdale
MARTIN, WILLIAM, Ynystawe, Llanelfach, Esq. Dec 31. Stricks and Bellingham, Swansea
MOORE, JOHN, Clifton, Bristol, Gent. Nov 30. Fry and Co, Bristol
QUILTER, THOMAS RISBY, Colchester, Sadler. Dec 31. Quilter, Fore st
REYNOLDS, JANE, Cotham New rd, Bristol. Dec 1. Cooke and Sons, Bristol
ROBERTSHAW, ISAAC, Allerton, York, Gent. Nov 17. Spencer, Bradford
SMITH, WILLIAM SMITH, Derby, Surveyor. Jan 20. Sale and Mills, Derby
SOUTHWELL, REV. MARCUS RICHARD, St. Alban's, Hertford, Clerk. Jan 1. Johnsons and Co, Austin Friars, Old Broad st
STONE, WILLIAM, Stratford Sub Castle, Wilts, Farmer. Dec 7. Nodder, City chambers, Salisbury
SWAINE, THOMAS JAMES, Lichfield grove, Church End, Finchley, Commercial Traveller. Dec 13. Poinson, Birmingham
SYMES, JOSIAH, Wells, Somerset, Pattern Maker. Dec 4. Foster, Wells
TUNTON, GEORGE, Kidderminster, out of business. Dec 1. Ivens and Morton, Kidderminster
WALKER, JAMES, Whitcham, Cumberland, Farmer. Nov 27. Butler, Broughton in Furness
WALL, THOMAS SENIOR, Maids Vale, Kilburn, Corn Merchant. Dec 10. Horton, Edgware rd, Paddington
WARDLEY, JOSHUA, Birtow in Furness, Farmer. Nov 27. Butler, Birtow in Furness
WELLS, ELIZA, West Stockwith, Nottingham. Dec 24. Oldman and Iveson, Gainsborough
WITCOMBS, PENELOPE, Kemerton, Gloucester. Nov 30. Brookes and Badham, Tewkesbury

WILLIAMS, HENRY, Swinton st, Gray's inn rd, Dairyman. Dec 7
Williams and Graham, Vestry house, Lawrence Pountney hill
WILSON, JOHN, Liverpool, Officer in H.M.'s Customs. Nov 19.
Steel, Sunderland
WOODS, THOMAS, Wythley Warren, Rutland, Farmer. Feb 1.
Atter, Stamford

[Gazette, Oct. 29.]

NEW ORDERS.

MASTER OF THE ROLLS' CHAMBERS.

SALES BY AUCTION UNDER THE COURT.

When the deposits to be paid to the auctioneer are estimated not to exceed £200, his undertaking in writing to pay the deposits into court will be accepted instead of security.

LISTS OF CREDITORS AND CONTRIBUTORIES.

It is particularly requested that the items in accounts and the names in lists of creditors and contributories may be numbered consecutively, and that the same number may not be repeated either in different parts of the same account or list, or in any supplementary account or list.

CHANCERY TAXING MASTERS.

Mr. Skirrow having for the last year found the following arrangements greatly facilitate the dispatch of business in his office, thinks it best to let it again be known that:—

Firstly—All orders relating to money, in or out of court, have precedence of all other business.

Secondly—That he himself proceeds with the taxation of all bills of costs in the first instance as soon as they are left in the office.

Thirdly—That all short or *ex parte* cases are taken every Saturday.

Mr. Davidson desires to give notice of the following arrangements for the dispatch of business in his office:—

All orders relating to money in or out of court will have precedence of all other business.

Unopposed, *ex parte*, and short bills will be disposed of forthwith, without requiring the parties to take formal appointments.

Solicitors will assist the taxing master in promptly disposing of business before him, by leaving their papers arranged in the order of the bill, with all vouchers for payments, counsels' fees, and (if any) chief clerk's certificates of attendances.

[It is deemed desirable that the above regulations should be brought afresh to the attention of our readers at the re-opening of the regular work in the offices.]

SAVINGS BANK ACT, 1880.

The following statement has been issued by the Postmaster-General: By the Savings Banks Act of last session any person on and after the 22nd inst. will be able to invest, at any Post-office in the United Kingdom at which there is a savings bank, small sums in any one of the following Government Stocks—Consols, Reduced, or New Three per Cents. The sums so invested must not be less than £10 and must not exceed £100 in any one year, and the aggregate amount held by any one investor must not exceed £300. The following amounts will be charged for the purchase of stock, and these sums will include all expenses connected with the subsequent collection of dividends; On stock not exceeding £25, 9d.; exceeding £25, but not exceeding £50, 1s. 3d.; exceeding £50, but not exceeding £75, 1s. 9d.; exceeding £75, but not exceeding £100, 2s. 3d. The charges on the sale of stock will be at the same rates up to £100; for £200 it will be two shillings and ninepence; and for £300, three shillings and threepence. The investment will be at the current price of the day on which it is made, and a certificate thereof will be sent to the investor by post. Similar arrangements will be made for sales of stock; and dividends will be collected by the Post-office, and placed to

the credit of the investor. Any person having invested £50 or more may, on application to the Post-office, obtain a stock certificate for £50 or any multiple of £50. These certificates will have coupons for dividends annexed, payable to bearer. Facilities similar to those just described for investment of small sums in Government Stocks will be granted by the Trustee Savings Banks.

COUNTY COURTS.

LANCASTER.

(Before W. A. HULTON, Esq., Judge.)

Oct. 22.—*Fyfe v. Committee of Lancaster Agricultural Society.*

This was an action against the managers of the Lancaster Agricultural Society for the loss of a dog sent to the last show of the society in September. The dog was exhibited in the Dandie Dinmont terrier class, was catalogued at £25, and was awarded the first prize. Shortly after the judging Mr. Fyfe found that the dog had disappeared. It was ascertained that another man had claimed it, and that he had returned it to the secretaries, requesting them not to give up the dog until the ownership was settled. For the defence it was contended that after the judging the animals entered were really in the hands of the exhibitors, that the duties of the show stewards respecting them ceased, and that therefore the defendants were not responsible for any loss.

His Honour said that the defendants had taken upon themselves to say by their rules that during the hours of exhibition no person (not even the owner) must remove any animal without their sanction; therefore, when the dog was returned to the pen after judging, it became, so to speak, the property of the managers as long as the show remained open, and they alone were responsible for it. He considered that plaintiff was entitled to a verdict, but he regarded the price placed upon it as fabulous. He would therefore give judgment for £10 and costs.

LEGAL NEWS.

A country storekeeper, says the *Virginia Law Journal*, was asked by counsel in what manner he kept his books, by single entry or double entry. He replied, they were not kept in an entry at all, but under the counter on the salt barrel.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court have, says the *Albany Law Journal*, so to speak, sat down on Judge Patterson of the Quarter Sessions of Lancaster, in the matter of Messrs. Steinman and Hensel, attorneys, and editors of the Lancaster *Intelligence* newspaper. The judge summarily expelled these gentlemen from the bar of his court for publishing a libellous article in their newspaper in reference to his judicial conduct. We urged pretty stoutly at the time that Judge Patterson had exceeded his judicial power, and that an attorney could only be disbarred for misconduct in his professional capacity or affecting his professional character. The Supreme Court have taken this view, and have vacated Judge Patterson's order, and restored the attorneys to the bar. The court also adopt the view that a libel, to amount to a breach of professional duty, must have been designed to acquire an influence over the judge in the exercise of his judicial functions by the instrumentality of popular prejudice—a motive which is not alleged to have existed in this case.

At the Somerset Quarter Sessions, on the 22nd ult., the chairman said, owing to the passing of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, it was necessary to make some alterations in the table of fees, and he had received a communication from the Home Office suggesting that it would be well that the court should consider the question and inform the Home Secretary their views on the matter; he would be glad of any advice they would have to offer, and would give it his best consideration. It was suggested that there should be a uniform table of fees; accordingly it was recommended and permission asked to have the table of fees altered. In

reply, however, they received a circular from the Home Office saying that the Home Secretary must adhere to the views explained in the circular of the 17th of May last, and hoped that on consideration the court would adopt the table of fees therein suggested, as many other courts had done. He (the chairman) said a great many had adopted them, and a great many had not, having taken the same view as that court. It was for the court to decide whether they chose to insist on their view, or whether they would accept the fiat of the Home Secretary, who now said that his views must be adhered to, but who, in his first circular, asked for their advice and said he would give his consideration to any suggestions they might make. There was a vast difference between the two communications. It was resolved to adopt the views of the Home Secretary.

Chief Justice Ryan, of Wisconsin, in a recent address to the graduating class of the University of Wisconsin, drew the following picture of pettifoggers:—"Behold the pettifogger, the blackleg of the law! He is, as his name imports, a stirrer-up of small litigation; a wet-nurse of trifling grievances and quarrels. He sometimes emerges from professional obscurity, and is charged with business which is disreputable only through his own tortuous devices. For the vermin can't forego his instincts, even among his betters. He is generally found, however, and he always begins in the lowest professional grade. Indeed, he is the troglodyte of the law. He has great cunning. He mistakes it for intelligence. He is a fellow of infinite pretence. He pushes himself everywhere, and is self-important wherever he goes; you will often find him in legislative bodies, in political conventions, in boards of supervisors, in common councils. He is sometimes there for specific villany; sometimes on general principles of corruption, waiting on Providence for any fraudulent job. He is always there for evil. The temper of his mind, the habits of his life, make him essentially mischievous. In all places he is always dishonest. When he cannot cheat for gain, he cheats for love. He haunts low places, and herds with the ignorant. It is his kindly office to get them by the ears, and to feed his vanity and his pocket from the quarrels he incites and foment. He is in everybody's way, and prys into everybody's business. He meddles in all things, and is indefatigable in mischief. He is just lawyer enough to be mischievous."

At the opening of the sittings in the Exchequer Division (before Mr. Baron Pollock and Mr. Justice Hawkins), Mr. Wills, Q.C., expressed the sense of the deep loss the profession had sustained by the death of the late Lord Chief Baron. Mr. Baron Pollock said it could not be a matter of surprise to any who were present that an opportunity should have been taken of saying something upon an occasion which so painfully reminded them of one who had been so recently taken from them, and whose loss they all so deeply regretted. For nearly forty years he knew the late Lord Chief Baron intimately, and he could bear testimony to his kindness, his wisdom, his firmness, and the earnestness of purpose with which he carried out any duty intrusted to him. All the judges agreed in respect for his great learning, for the painstaking care with which he exhausted every possible matter which could have had any bearing on the subject upon which he was engaged, and also in the feeling of love they felt for the man with whom they were daily associated in their duty, and who was never known to say one single unkind word or to harbour one single unkind thought.

A meeting of the magistrates of York city was held on Tuesday, when, in accordance with the invitation of the Home Secretary, the following recommendations were unanimously passed:—"Resolved that the following be recorded as the opinions of her Majesty's justices of the peace, acting in and for the city of York:—1. That the treatment of children and young persons, after apprehension or information, and before conviction, should be further distinguished from that of adults than is now allowed by law. 2. That the power to commit a child (under 12) or a young person (under 16) on remand to the workhouse, rather than to prison, on a charge laid under the Industrial Schools Act, should be extended to every justice of the peace on every charge against a child or young person. 3. That the power to adjudge a private whipping with a birch rod, after conviction, on a charge dealt with under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, should be extended to

her Majesty's justices of the peace on every conviction of a child or young person by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction. 4. That power be given to courts of summary jurisdiction to inflict on the parent or guardian of any child or young person convicted by such court, either in addition to or instead of any punishment inflicted on such child or young person, a fine not exceeding that to which such child or young person has become liable, in any case in which such court is satisfied that such parent or guardian has, by neglecting to take proper care of such child or young person, or otherwise, conducted to such misconduct. 5. That children (under 12) should not be imprisoned at the instance of a court of summary jurisdiction, unless it be on commitment for trial by jury. 6. That, except in so far as it may affect children (under 12), it is not desirable to repeal the law which requires every young person committed to a reformatory school to suffer imprisonment for not less than ten days. 7. That the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, requires amendment, more particularly by extending the protection of the State over the scholars after they leave these schools, which are too much confused in the public mind with reformatory schools, from which they should be kept quite distinct; the latter being concerned in correcting crime among young persons who have become actual criminals, and have been imprisoned as such, while the former are preventing crime in children and young persons who have not been convicted of crime, and have not been in prison."

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	V.C. MALINS.
Monday, Nov. 8.	Mr. Cobby	Mr. Latham	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday..... 9	Mr. Jackson	Leach	Ward
Wednesday.... 10	Cobby	Latham	Pemberton
Thursday..... 11	Mr. Jackson	Leach	Ward
Friday..... 12	Cobby	Latham	Pemberton
Saturday..... 13	Mr. Jackson	Leach	Ward
	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.	Mr. Justice F.R.
Monday, Nov. 8.	Mr. Merivale	Mr. Clowes	Mr. Teesdale
Tuesday..... 9	King	Koe	Farrer
Wednesday.... 10	Merivale	Clowes	Teesdale
Thursday..... 11	King	Koe	Farrer
Friday..... 12	Merivale	Clowes	Teesdale
Saturday..... 13	King	Koe	Farrer

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

MIDDLESEX.—TRINITY SITTING, 1886.

The list contains all actions entered in Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions, in which notice of trial has been given, and also all actions in the Chancery Division, in which notice has been given of trial before a judge and jury; up to and including November 3, 1886.

LIST OF ACTIONS FOR TRIAL.

Ex 1 Hickey (Beltrage and M) v Montefiore (Lewis and Lewis) Commission SJ	Q B 2 Creed (A J Murray) v Millett (Rocce H and S) Commission	Q B 3 Brown (Merriman M and Co) v Elkington and ors (Lumley and L) Commission	Q B 4 Wilbraham (Chapman T and B) v The Maritime Passengers and Mariners Insurance Co Ltd (Harrisons and Son) Stayed	Q B 5 Benjamin (J Frost) v Litten (F A Lewy) Commission	Q B 6 Benjamin (M Abrahams and R) v Higginbottom (F T Dubois) Commission SJ	Q B 7 Hallward (C B Hallward) v Blanford and ors (C J Curtis; G H K Fisher) Postponed	Ex 8 Joshua (A E Webb) v Green (Hare and F) Commission	Ex 9 Palmes (Lake B and Co) v Hope and anr (Shoubridge and M) without jury postponed	Ex 10 Same (Same) v Beavan (Same) without jury postponed	Ex 11 Llywdarth Iron & Co (Same) (Houghton and B) v Fearn (A S H Jones) Commission	Q B 12 Mayer (A G Ditton) v Robinson (P W Naser) Commission	Ex 13 Spiller (C E Goldring) v Baum (Evans and R) postponed	Q B 14 General Share Trust Co Ltd (J S Coleman) v Baum and anr (Same) Stayed	Ex 15 Enthoven (Collette and C) v Jacobson (G M Cooke) postponed	Q B 16 Chamberlaine (S G Ashwin) v T W Wallington (Whitaker and W) postponed SJ	Q B 17 Same (Same) v J Wallington (Same) postponed SJ
---	---	---	--	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	---	---

Ex 18 Marshall (G M Cooke) v Lindley and anr (J Davies) postponed SJ	C P 19 Chalmers (J Whitehouse) v Chalmers (Nelson Son and H) Commission	Q B 20 Bennett (W E Baxter) v England and ors (In person; W F Stokes) Stayed	C P 21 Caudle (F T Newbould) v Austin (Morgan and Gilks) Stayed	Q B 22 Procter (J Neal) v Dunham (Pittman and L) Stayed SJ	C P 23 Fajkmaier (Norton R N and B) v Fothergill and anr (Hollams Son and C; Field Roscoe and Co) Stayed SJ	Ex 24 Page (Hacon and T) v Kerridge (Bridges S and Co) Stayed	Q B 25 Markwick (G Thompson) v Cortis (A S Edmunds) postponed SJ	Q B 26 Moody and anr (Lewis and Lewis) v Fisher (J Donaghe) Stayed	Ex 27 Champion (Duignan and S) v Walter (Purkis and P) common	Q B 28 McDonnell (Snell and G) v Copestake (Mercer and M) Stayed SJ	C P 29 Treadwin (W R Philp) v Nunn (J D Blake) postponed	C P 30 Funge and anr (J H Child) v Same (Same) postponed	C P 31 Cuyas v Sampere (Tilleard G and H) v Mac Andrew and Co (Kearsey Son and H) Commission SJ	Q B 32 Taylor (Hurlford and T) v Batten (Waltons B and W) Commission SJ	C P 33 Davies and anr (Nickinson P and N) v Nunn (Blake and W) postponed	Ex 34 McGregor (W Eley) v Tinker and anr (Rollit and Son) Stayed	Ex 35 Taylor and ors (R S Taylor and Sons) v Smith and anr (Brandons) postponed	C P 36 Coleman (Campbell R and Co) v Guignes (E D Lewis) Stayed	C P 37 Fowler and ors (Wilson B and C) v Alison (Thompson and D) without jury	Ex 38 Stubbs (Yeo and Warner) v Ashton (Bennett D and B) Stayed SJ	Ex 39 Pearson (C Mossop) v Gardner (Field R and Co) Stayed	Ex 40 Russell and anr (Taylor H and T) v Nunn (Blake and W) postponed	C P 41 Dorking Grey Stone Lime Co Ltd (J Edell) v Hack and ors (Saffery and Co) Stayed	C P 42 Cowley (F Scott) v Booth (Rye and C) Stayed SJ	Q B 43 Henning and anr (Thompson and D) v Mills (Simpson and C) Stayed	Q B 44 Same (Same) v Smerdon (J H Lamb)	Q B 45 Same (Same) v Dimmock (Same)	C P 46 Gask (J B May) v Nunn (Blake and W) Stayed	Ex 47 Taylor and ors (Paterson S and B) v Blowers (Beaumont and B) Stayed	Ex 48 Heap (C Mossop) v Hesketh (Lewis and L) postponed SJ	C P 49 Jacobs (L Davis) v Charles Reynolds and Co (C Sawbridge) Commission SJ	Ex 50 Isaacson (Dod and L) v Currie (Lucas and Son) Stayed SJ	Q B 51 Nowell (A G Ditton) v Stocker and ors (W Justice) part heard SJ	Q B 52 Same (Same) v Bucknill and anr (Mead and D; J Hill) Stayed SJ	C P 53 Sadler and ors (Chappell Son and G) v Nangle (Vallance and V) Stayed	Q B 54 Voss (J W Few) v Thomas (Hemley and H) Stayed	C P 55 Hooper and anr (Tilleard G and H) More le Blanche and Co and ors (L J B Rawlins) Commission without jury	Ex 56 Stace and ors (T White and Sons) v Walking and ors (Sole T and K)	C P 57 Tasmanian Main Line Ry Co (Wilson B and C) v Clark and ors (Hunt T and Co; Burchells; Hargrove and Co) SJ	Ex 58 Ibbotson (Bordman) v Buckley and ors (Jukes and Co)	C P 59 Williams (G E Carpenter) v Nowell (A G Ditton) Stayed SJ	Chy 60 Sovereign Life Assurance Co (Campbell R and H) v Dent (Crook and S) postponed SJ	C P 61 Crook (F C James) v Clark and Son (G S Warrington) Stayed	Q B 62 King and Co (Eardley H and R) v Langton (In Person) SJ	Q B 63 Tipples (G Crafter) v Budden (Stollard and W)	Ex 64 Parkes (T W Goldring) v London and St Katherine Docks Co (W M Hacon)	Ex 65 Llewellyn (T White and Sons) v Strangward (Saunders H and B)	Q B 66 Capital and Counties Bank (Nash and F) v Henty and Sons (Robinson P and S) SJ	Q B 67 Rice (Lewis and L) v East and West India Dock Co (Freshfields and W) Stayed SJ	Q B 68 The Nitro-Phosphate and Odams Chemical Manure Co Ltd (Kingsford and Co) v Roberts (Williamson H and Co) Stayed SJ	Q B 69 Richardson (Bird M and R) v Holdam and Canning (Mathews and S) postponed SJ	Ex 70 Parris (J N Mason) v Blowers (Beaumont and W) Stayed	Q B 71 Redmond (Wontner and S) v Gaubie (Lewis and L)	C P 72 Gazel (H Montagu) v Rotherhelm (Lumley and L) Commission	Ex 73 Belli (P A Haanrott) v Lane (Pess and Legg) SJ	Ex 74 Iles (Taylor and Hales) v Brook and Co (J B Lay)	C P 75 British Mutual Investment Co Ltd (Barnard and Co) v Williams (Stephens and S) postponed	Ex 76 Clarke (Taylor H and T) v Smith (Brandon and Co) postponed	Q B 77 Leachall (Merriman P and M) v Shroove and ors (A E Tower; W P Moore) postponed SJ	Q B 78 Scott (H T Tideman) v Scott (G H Fitch) Stayed	Ex 79 Martin (W B Brook) v Dunn (A T Hewitt) without jury	Q B 80 Maple and Co (Lumley and L) v Mapleson (J and R Gish)	Q B 81 Brewis (O O Humphreys and Son) v Stapleole (S Scott) SJ	Ex 82 Huband (R D Lewis) v Flight (Lewis and Sons) postponed	Ex 83 Newton and Son (J M Chamberlain) v Burwood and anr (J Sciffe) postponed
--	---	--	---	--	---	---	--	--	---	---	--	--	---	---	--	--	---	---	---	--	--	---	--	---	--	---	-------------------------------------	---	---	--	---	---	--	--	---	--	---	---	--	---	---	---	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	---

OP 84 Barwick (J D Botterell) v Pirie and Co (Parker and Co) commission
Ex 85 Guelton (F G Gorton) v Harrison (W Rawlins)
Ex 86 Hine-Haycock and anr (H Haycock and B) v Hoare and wife (T W Buckler) without jury
(To be continued.)

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

November 4, 1880.

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price
Stock	Caledonian	100	118½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	115
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	66
Stock	Great Northern	100	132
Stock	Do., A Stock	100	124½
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	128½
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	136
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	149½
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	103½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	157
Stock	London and South Western	100	159
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	65½
Stock	Metropolitan	100	122½
Stock	Do., District	100	80½
Stock	Midland	100	187
Stock	North British	100	94
Stock	North Eastern	100	173½
Stock	North London	100	180
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	88½
Stock	South Devon	100	—
Stock	South-Eastern	100	136

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BRAMISH.—On Oct. 29, at Richmond, Surrey, the wife of A. Beamish, Barrister-at-law, of a son.
EVANS.—On Oct. 28, at Berkeley Lodge, W., the wife of Frank Evans, Barrister-at-law, of a son.
LAW.—On Sept. 22, at Moulmein, British Burmah, the wife of C. W. Law, Barrister-at-law, of a son.
POTTER.—On Oct. 28, at 83, West-hill, Sydenham, the wife of Arthur H. Poyser, Barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

MARRIAGE.

HENN—GORE.—On Oct. 28, at Kilmarry Parish Church, Francis Blackburne Henn, of Rivaldale, Ballina, resident Magistrate and Barrister-at-law, to Helen Letitia Elizabeth, daughter of the late Captain Francis Gore, of Woodlawn, county Clare.

LONDON GAZETTES.

BANKRUPTCY.

FRIDAY, Oct. 29, 1880.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
 To Surrender in the Country.

Abraham, William, London st, Derby, Clothier. Pet Oct 20. Weller. Derby, Nov 9 at 12
Bentock, Samuel, Springfield pk, Acton, Builder. Pet Sept 26. Roston. Brentford, Nov 16 at 2
Eshaw, John, Smithwhite, York, Butcher. Pet Oct 27. Jones. Huddersfield, Nov 11 at 11
Whitemore, William, Clarendon, Somerset, Beer Retailer. Pet Oct 26. Harley. Bristol, Nov 19 at 2

TUESDAY, Nov. 2, 1880.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
 To Surrender in London.

MacLachlan, John, and Charles Blanc, Fenchurch st, Merchants. Pet Oct 20. Peppas. Nov 17 at 12
Warne, Thomas, Whitstone pk, Lincoln's inn fields, Builder. Mot Oct 20. Peppas. Nov 17 at 12 30
 To Surrender in the Country.
Airey, Edward, Beech lanes, Worcester, Brick Manufacturer. Pet Oct 20. Watson. Oldbury, Nov 27 at 11
Broadbent, T E B, Fort Blockhouse, Gosport, Lieutenant in H M's Submarine Miners. Pet Oct 30. Renny. Portsmouth, Nov 18 at 12
Kennedon, Joseph, Shipley, York, Builder. Pet Oct 29. Lee. Bradford, Nov 19 at 12
Hirsh, Gustav, Manchester. Pet Oct 20. Lister. Manchester, Nov 19 at 12
Jolly, Thomas, Ousden, Suffolk, Innkeeper. Pet Oct 30. Eaden. Cambridge, Nov 20 at 10 30

BANKRUPTCIES ANNOUNCED.

FRIDAY, Oct. 29, 1880.

Hurwitz, Abraham, Portsdown rd, Maida Vale. Oct 26
Jones, Richard Edward, Walter Consell Searle, and William Purkiss: Wincott, Billiter st, Merchants. Oct 16
TUNNICLIFFE, Nov. 2, 1880.
Fogg, James, Hyde, Chester, Beerhouse keeper. Oct 29

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1880.

Adams, Thomas, Bath, Market Gardener. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Moger, Wood st, Bath
Agg, John, Bristol, Beer Retailer. Nov 6 at 12 at offices of Andrews, Nicholas st, Bristol. Ayre, Bristol
Allen, Robert, and Robert Bew North, Wolverhampton, Iron Merchants. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Underhill, Darlington st, Wolverhampton
Arthur, Benjamin,* Llanelly, Carmarthen, Licensed Victualler. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Morgan, Wind st, Swansea
Baker, William Charles, Southampton, Grocer. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Bell, Portland st, Southampton
Barrett, Henry, Wootton Bassett, Bootmaker. Nov 6 at 10 at offices of Jackson, Allerton buildings, New Swindon
Benson, Edward, Leeds, Provision Dealer. Nov 11 at 3 at the Law Institute, Leeds. Watson
Birch, Thomas, Liverpool, Bootmaker. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Quin, South John st, Liverpool
Bladon, Alfred, Birmingham, Hatter. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Johnson and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham
Boden, Jesse, Birmingham, Iron Plate Worker. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Wilson, Temple row, Birmingham
Bracegirdle, William, and William Minshall, Lstwich, Chester, Ship Builders. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Green and Dixon, Castle-chambers, Northwich
Bradshaw, James, Manchester, out of business. Nov 17 at 3 at offices of Oram and Co, Peter st, Manchester
Briggs, Levi, Wakefield, York, Grocer. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Lodge, Townhall chmbrs, King st, Wakefield
Briggs, Thomas, Manchester, Yarn Merchant. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Leigh, Brown st, Manchester
Burholt, Henry Francis, Andover rd, Holloway, Baker. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Merriman and Co, Austinfriars
Butterfield, Elijah Tatham, Shipley, York, out of business. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Berry and Robinson, Charles st, Bradford
Chapman, William, Wetheringsett, Suffolk, Farmer. Nov 15 at 12 30 at offices of Titchmarsh, Museum st, Ipswich. Bavin and Daynes, Norwich
Christer, George Alfred, Chatsworth rd, Clapton Park, Provision Merchant. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Christmas, Walbrook
Clark, Joseph Henry, Claygate, Surrey, Grocer. Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Wilkinson and Howlett, Bedford st, Covent Garden
Clark, Richard, Hamstead, Hertford, of no occupation. Nov 13 at 11 at the Old Red Lion, St Albans. Preezy, Kettering
Clarke, Samuel, Loughborough, Leicester, Provision Dealer. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Goode, Baxter Gate, Loughborough
Clarke, William, Nottingham, Journeyman Machinist. Nov 12 at 12 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham
Cleavin, John Robert, Leeds, Saddler. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Boin-ton, Old Bank chmbrs, Leeds
Collie, William, Edgware rd, Mantle Warehouseman. Nov 11 at 2 at offices of Maples and Co, Frederick pl, Old Jewry
Cope, John, Bedford, Lancaster, Shoe Maker. Nov 11 at 10 30 at the Albion Hotel, Piccadilly, Manchester. Whittingham, Leigh
Corbett, Samuel, Wellington, Salop, Tea Dealer. Nov 12 at 12 at the Crewe Arms Hotel, Crewe. Carrane, Wellington
Crawshaw, Robert, Colne, Lancaster, Farmer. Nov 12 at 3 at the Exchange Hotel, Nicholas street, Burnley. Sutcliffe, Burnley
Crolley, Esther, Llandudno, Carnarvon, Greengrocer. Nov 18 at 12 at offices of Carruthers, Lord st, Liverpool
Dobson, John James, New Tunstall, Durham, Grocer. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland
Dorell, Richard, Swansea, Grocer. Nov 16 at 12 30 at the Merchants Association, Broad st, Bristol. Evans and Davies, Swansea
Dowell, William, Thornton Baxby, York, Farmer. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Wilkinson, St Helen's sq, York
Duckworth, Joseph, Oswaldtwistle, Lancaster, Innkeeper. Nov 17 at 3 at offices of Cronshaw, White Bull Inn, Church st, Blackburn. Barlow, Acerington
Edwards, William Lloyd, Penygroes, Carnarvon, Grocer. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Bee, Castle st, Carnarvon
Eisler, Louis, and Arthur Alfred Bernard, Great Tower st, Wine Merchants. Nov 15 at 2 at 145, Cheapside. Crouch and Co, Queen Victoria st
Ellison, John, Grange, near Egremon, Cumberland, Farmer. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Brown, Scotch st, Whitehaven
Ensor, Benjamin Cutts, Birmingham, Electro Plater. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Farr, Colmore row, Birmingham
Evatt, William, Istock, Leicester, Builder. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Lowry and Battiscombe, Market pl, Leicester
Feldmann, Egon, Hadleigh, Essex, Merchant. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Phelps and Co, Gresham st
Fells, Frederick George, Syston, Leicester, Grocer. Nov 12 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Seilbourne bldgs, Millstone lane, Leicester
Finney, Samuel, Longton, Stafford, Furniture Dealer. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Clarke and Hanley, Church st, Longton
Garbutt, George, Scarborough, York, Builder. Nov 5 at 3 at offices of Appleyard, Newborough st, Scarborough
Glasebrook, James, Shoreham, Sussex, Master Mariner. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Kye, North st, Brighton
Gosling, William, jun, Allbrook Eastleigh, Hants, Engineer. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Shuttle, Portland st, Southampton
Gregory, Joseph, Congerston, Leicester, Tailor. Nov 16 at 1 30 at offices of Tippetts, Atherstone

Griffiths, Edwin, Liverpool, Builder. Nov 10 at 2 at offices of Eity, Lord st, Liverpool
 Guest, Joseph James, Brencley, Kent, Farmer. Nov 10 at 3 at the New Inn, Maidstone. Palmer, Tonbridge
 Haines, William Henry, Boston, Lincoln, Bookseller. Nov 9 at 2 at offices of Thomas, Emery lane, Boston
 Handley, Walter John, West Ham, Essex, Market Porter. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Vanderpump, Gray's inn sq
 Holt, John, Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester, Provision Dealer, Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Binfith, Bridge st, Manchester
 Huddleston, Robert Asher, Wisbech St Mary's, Cambridge, Farmer. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Ollard, York row, Wisbech
 Hyatt, William, Albrighton, Salop, Farmer. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Dallow, Queen sq, Wolverhampton
 Ince, Charles, Drolwiche, Worcester, Fruiterer. Nov 13 at 1 at offices of Scott and Horton, New rd, Bromsgrove
 Jackson, William, Spennymoor, Durham, Painter. Nov 17 at 11.30 at offices of Salkeld, Elvet bridge, Durham
 Jenkins, Thomas, Kidwelly, Carmarthen, Grocer. Nov 8 at 3 at offices of Howell, Stepney st, Llanelly
 Lloyd, Caroline, Saint Ishmael's, Carmarthenshire, Innkeeper. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Thomas and Brown, Lower Market st, Carmarthen
 Lobley, William, Batley, York, Grocer. Nov 12 at 11 at the Black Bull Hotel, Batley, Park, Batley
 Lockwood, James Leggitt, Thortholmes, Oswest, Farmer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Credland, Gainsborough
 Lorrimer, John, Kirkdale, Liverpool, Ale and Porter Bottler. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Eity, Lord st, Liverpool
 McHolme, James, Ormskirk, Lancaster, Draper. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Gibson and Co, South John st, Liverpool. Nordon, Liverpool
 Moscrop, John Brown, and William Moscrop, Norden, nr Rochdale, Lancaster, Cotton Spinners. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Boote and Edgar, Booth st, Manchester
 Nicholson, John Mills, Birmingham, out of business. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Cheston, Moor st, Birmingham
 Oliviant, William Sharpe, Stow, Lincoln, Farmer. Nov 17 at 11 at offices of Hayes and Son, Market pl, Gainsborough
 Owens, William, Swansea, cattle Dealer. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Evans and Davies, Wind st, Swansea
 Palmer, John, jun, Berkswell, Warwick, Farmer. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Hughes and Masser, Little Park st, Coventry
 Peacock, Samuel, Nottingham, Draper. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Whittingham, Middle pavement, Nottingham
 Pellow, Charles Robert, Newton Abbot, Devon, Plumber. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Creed, Courtenay st, Newton Abbot
 Philp, George Langdon, Plymouth, Painter. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Square, George st, Plymouth
 Powell, John, York, Builder. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Crumbie, Stonegate, York
 Preston, Edward, Youghorpe, York, Farm Labourer. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Peters, New st, York
 Pritchard, Boaz, Gorton, Lancashire, Grocer. Nov 17 at 3 at 35, Cannon st, Manchester. Alderson
 Richmond, Charles, King Henry's walk, Balls Pond rd, House Decorator. Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Rubinstein, Raymond bldgs, Gray's inn
 Rickard, Thomas Mantle, Waltham, Lincoln, Grocer. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Haddelsey and Haddelsey, Royal Cook chmbrs, Great Grimsby
 Roberts, Robert, and Richard Roberts, Seaforth, Lancashire, Joiners. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Oliver and Co, Cook st, Liverpool
 Robinson, William Brompton, York, Farmer. Nov 11 at 11 at Golden Lion Hotel, Northallerton, Teale, Middlesbrough
 Sadler, Mason, Harrogate, Boot Maker. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Bateson and Hutchinson, Harrogate
 Sanderson, Benjamin, Northallerton, York, China Dealer. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Waistell, Northallerton
 Saunders, Richard Henry, Liverpool, Grocer. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Gibson and Co, South John st, Liverpool. Smith and Son, Liverpool
 Scott, John Seymour, Leeds, Tile Merchant. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Austin, Park lane, Leeds
 Seward, John Napper, Lydd, Kent, Farmer. Nov 11 at 12 at offices of Phillips and Cheesman, Havelock rd, Hastings
 Sowards, Joseph, Navenby, Lincoln, Grocer. Nov 12 at 3 at the Great Northern Hotel, Lincoln. Holdich, New Sleaford
 Sheriff, Edward, Birmingham, Cooper. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Shrimpton, Henry, Oledonian rd, Retail Grocer. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Tilley and Co, Queen Victoria st. Hales, Chancery lane
 Sibley, Daniel, Nottingham, Tailor. Nov 17 at 18 at offices of Armitage and Co, John William st, Huddersfield. Black, Nottingham
 Smith, George Walter, Landport, Portsea, Hants, Licensed Victualler. Nov 12 at 4 at Totterdell's Hotel, St George's sq, Portsea. Hall King, Portsea
 Smith, Jeremiah, Wolverhampton, Tinplate Worker. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Smith, John, Colman's, Hackney rd, Baker. Nov 5 at New Corn Exchange Sale Rooms, Mark lane, in lieu of the place originally named
 Smyth, Robert Samuel, Dartmouth, Devon, Refreshment house Keeper. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Square, George st, Plymouth
 Swift, Edward, Milton-next-Graivesend, Stonemason. Nov 18 at 10.30 at offices of Mitchell, Windmill st, Milton-next-Graivesend
 Taylor, Henry, Wakefield, Tinner. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Lodge, Townhall chambers, King st, Wakefield
 Terry, George, Bessy, Kent, Corn Factor. Nov 22 at 12 at Cannon st Hotel, Cannon st, Moss, Gracchurch st
 Tipler, Charles, Hatfield Broad Oak, Essex, Farmer. Nov 11 at 10.30 at Railway Hotel, Bishop's Stortford. Snell, Dunmow
 Varley, William Major, Falsgrave, nr Scarborough, Bookkeeper. Nov 10 at 2 at Cornwall and Watts, Queen st, Scarborough
 Vandy, William, Roman rd, Bow, Fishmonger. Nov 8 at 4 at 202, High Holborn, Standland, Pentonville rd

Vaughan, Edward, Essex rd, Acton, Builder. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Aird, Eastcheap
 Vening, John, Lower Clevedon, Somerset, Mason. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Ward, Albion chmbrs, Bristol
 Westacott, Thomas, Bristol, Baker. Nov 13 at 2 at offices of Stevens, Nicholas st, Bristol. Willmott, Bristol
 Weiss, John, Park st, Bethnal green, Baker. Nov 9 at 4 at offices of Jones, Mark lane
 Wilcox, Thomas, Upper Marsh, Lambeth, Job Master. Nov 11 at 2 at offices of Christmas, Walbrook
 Williams, David, Colwyn Bay, Denbigh, Lodging house Keeper. Nov 17 at 2 at Grosvenor Hotel, James, Llanrwst
 Williams, Evan James, Brecon, Corn and Meal Factor. Nov 9 at 2 at offices of Bishop, Wheat st, Brecon
 Withers, Jacob, Whitchurch, Southampton, Farmer. Nov 15 at 3 at White Hart Hotel, Andover. Footner and Son, Andover
 Wright, Charles, Stockwell rd, Surrey, Chemist. Nov 10 at 2 at 109, Ch eapside. Kent and Kent

TUESDAY, Nov. 2, 1880.

Adams, Harry Tawton, Ancill villas, Fulham, Builder. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Render, Holborn Viaduct
 Ainge, Alfred Stockley, Mountsorell, Leicester, Grocer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Wright, Belvoir st, Leicester
 Ainsie, Edward, Harbourne, Stafford, Brick Maker. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Bascliffe, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
 Allen, George, Herbert terrace, Peckham, Grocer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Pannell and Co, Basinghall st. Catlin, Wormwood Old Broad st
 Allum, Henry, Senior st, Harrow rd, Grocer. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Foster, Brunswick sq, Bloomsbury
 Anfield, William, Great Driffield, York, Millwright. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Dunn, Market pl, Great Driffield
 Arrowsmith, George Henry, Cambridge, Hosier. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Gunn, St Andrew's st, Cambridge
 Bev, Thomas, Northampton, Umbrella Manufacturer. Nov 16 at 12 at offices of Hensman, Giles's st, Northampton
 Biscombe, William, Plumstead, Kent, Builder. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Bradley, Mark lane
 Booker, John, Henry st, Deptford, Chandler. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Norris, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane
 Bourne, Francis, Brede, Sussex, Farmer. Nov 13 at 12 at the Swan Hotel, High st, Hastings. Jones and Glenister, Hastings
 Bradburn, John, Ashton-in-Makerfield, Lancaster, Coal Owner. Nov 17 at 11 at offices of France, Churchgate, Wigan
 Bray, Samuel, Alasgar, Chester, Aerated Water Manufacturer. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Bennett, Piccadilly buildings, Hanley
 Broadbent, Joseph Knowles, Weaste, near Manchester, out of business. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Eastwood, Princess st, Manchester. Rigg, Manchester
 Brown, William, Faland, near Crowle, Lincoln, Joiner. Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Pickering, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Robert and Lee, Hull
 Brown, William, Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Photographer. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of Moores and Bonney, Tewkesbury
 Bruce, John, Thurstonstone, Leicester, Thrashing Machine Proprietor. Nov 15 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Selborne bldgs, Millstone lane, Leicester
 Campion, William, Guisborough, York, Rope Maker. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Carroll, Thomas James, St Helen's, Lancaster, Confectioner. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Riley and Cook, Hardshaw st, Saint Helen's
 Croton, James, Tamworth, Stafford, Grocer. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Nevill and Atkins, Colehill, Tamworth
 Daniel, Joseph, Cotheridge, Worcester, Farmer. Nov 16 at 12 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, the Cross, Worcester
 Dimmack, Thomas James, Bilston, Stafford, Horse Dealer. Nov 15 at 11 at Globe Hotel, Mount Pleasant. Bowen, Mount Pleasant
 Dyer, Charles Stephen, Amivch, Anglessea, Mineral Agent. Nov 15 at 12 at Dinorbin Hotel, Amivch. Allanson, Carnarvon
 Evans, William, Mount st, Grovesend sq, Grocer. Nov 10 at 2 at offices of Mitchell and Co, Theobald's rd, Gray's inn
 Felton, Charles, Edgbaston, Birmingham, out of business. Nov 19 at 11 at offices of Cartwright, Colmore row, Birmingham
 Fleet, Joseph, Crewe, Chester, Grocer. Nov 24 at 3 at offices of Cooke, Temple chmbrs, Oak st, Crewe
 Fletcher, William, Greenwith, Ripley, Derby. Nov 18 at 11 at Bell Hotel, Sadler gate, Derby. Curshaw, Ripley
 Forder, John, Seething, Norfolk. Thatcher. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Kent, St Andrew's Hall plain, Norwich
 Fogot, Wilko Hermann, John st, Minster, Ship Broker. Nov 18 at 2 at Cannon st Hotel. Cattarns and Co, Mark lane
 Franks, Harris, Kingston upon Hull, Cap Manufacturer. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Stead and Sibree, Bishop lane, Kingston upon Hull
 Froer, George, Oadby, Leicester, Milkman. Nov 17 at 12.30 at offices of Hunter and Curtis, Halford st, Leicester
 Fusedale, Knott, Portobello rd, Notting hill, Cheesemonger. Nov 16 at 2 at offices of Ashton, Werwick st, Regent st
 Gearing, Edwin, Farnborough, Kent, Smith. Nov 12 at 2 at offices of Moreby, White and Co, Chancery lane
 Gibbon, Morgan, Llantrissnot, Ffordale Grocers. Nov 18 at 11 at offices of Morgan and Scott, High st, Cardiff
 Gill, Richard, New Ferry, Chester, Grocer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Thompson, Hamilton st, Birkenhead
 Graham, Mary Ann, Teignmouth, Devon, Gentlewoman. Nov 19 at 3.30 at London Hotel, Teignmouth. Patrick
 Greenway, Francis Thomas, and Charles Hobbs, Cowley rd, Uxbridge, Stonemasons. Nov 19 at 12 at offices of Fletcher, Bond st, Walbrook
 Gribble, Thomas, Brook pl, Hampstead rd, Iron Chair Bedstead Manufacturer. Nov 25 at 3 at 33, Kingsland green, Dalston. Pentou
 Grice, Robert, Whiselandine, Rutland, Farmer. Nov 13 at 3 at George Hotel, Oakham. Atter Stamford
 Hart, Henry James, Birmingham, Livy Stable Keeper. Nov 12 at 11 at Grand Hotel, Colmore row, Birmingham. Huggings and Mallard, Birmingham

Haslam, Samuel, Bolton, Lancaster, Beerseller. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Rutter and Finney, Mawdsley st, Bolton.

Hawley, Thomas, Denstone, nr Rochester, Innkeeper. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Flint and Flint, Uttoxeter

Helm, Richard, Barwick-in-Elmet, York, Publican. Nov 18 at 3 at the Law Institution, Albion pl, Leeds. Billington, Leeds

Hemmingway, John, jun, Dewsbury, Grocer. Nov 22 at 11 at offices of Simpson, Union st, Dewsbury

Herring, James Herbert, Exeter st, Chelsea, China and Glass Dealer. Nov 23 at 3 at offices of Hayward, King st, Guildhall

Hillyer, George, Northampton, Coal Merchant. Nov 13 at 11.30 at offices of Cooper, Market sq, Northampton. Rands, Northampton

Hipper, Robert Thomas, Scoles Green, Norwich, Butcher. Nov 15 at 12 at offices of Gaze, Bank st, Norwich

Hoddy, John Pallant, Chedgrave, Norfolk, Blacksmith. Nov 20 at 13 at offices of Coaks and Co, Bank plain, Norwich

Hornby, George, Blackpool, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 15 at 11 at No. 14, Winkley st, Preston

Hughes, Edwin Ernest, Llangollen, Denbigh, Brewer. Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Sherratt and Son, Regent st, Wrexham, Pasingham, Bala

Humphreys, William, Welshpool, Montgomery, Draper. Nov 18 at 12 at offices of Harrison, Berriew st, Welshpool

Jefferson, William, Pateley Bridge, York, Farmer. Nov 15 at 12.30 at offices of Bateson and Hutchinson, Ripon

Kay, Robert Henry, Manchester, Dealer in Fancy Goods. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Lowndes, King st, Manchester

Kelly, William Anthony, Seacombe, Chester, Wholesale Grocer. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Rose and Price, North John st, Liverpool. Stephens and Danger, Liverpool

Kennell, Frederick John, Bath, Grocer. Nov 11 at 3 at 17, York st, Bath. Tyack

Knapman, Henry Thomas, Great Yarmouth, Gent. Nov 16 at 13 at offices of Wilshire, Great Yarmouth

Lewis, Richard, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Wine Merchant. Nov 16 at 1 at Boot Hotel, Aberdare. Smith and Lawrence, Swansea

Lloyd, William, West Bromwich, Stafford, Wheelwright. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of Topham, High st, West Bromwich

Lovregrove, Thomas Henry, Price's st, Blackfriars, out of business. Nov 8 at 10 at offices of Hope, Bell yd, Fleet st

Mace, James, Gloucester, Fishmonger. Nov 15 at 4 at offices of Jackson, George st, Gloucester

Markley, James, Birkenhead, Grocer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of offices of Leeming, Duncan st, Birkenhead. Hannan and Pugh, Birkenhead

Marsh, Thomas, Newark, Nottingham, Refreshment house Keeper. Nov 19 at 3 at offices of Footitt, Market pj, Newark

Massey, William, Leeds, Grocer. Nov 16 at 1 at offices of Rooke and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar lane, Leeds

Molesworth, John, Wapload, Lincoln, Farmer. Nov 17 at 12 at White Hart Hotel, Spalding

Moorfoot, Cook, Hilary, Castle Dealer. Nov 17 at 3 at Court house, Downham Market. Nunn

Nash, John Pritchard, Kingston-upon-Hull, Master of Arts. Nov 12 at George Hotel, Whitefriargate. Kingston-upon-Hull. King and Mayne

Newhouse, Henry Lewis Titus, Great Tower st, Wine and Spirit Merchant. Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Moss, Winchester house, Old Broad st

Newham, Benjamin, Frith st, Soho, Licensed Victualler. Nov 19 at 2 at offices of Nash and Field, Queen st, Chopsale

Nicholls, George Frederick, Boddington, Gloucester. Innkeeper. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Frum, Regent st, Cheltenham

North, William George Thomas, Upper Norwood, Surrey, Cheesemonger. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Wynne and Co, Laurence Pountney hill, Cannon st. Streeter, Croydon

Norton, Samuel Walter, Stockport, Lancaster, Printer. Nov 17 at 3 at offices of Walker, Ann st, Manchester

O'Hare, Peter, Birkenhead, Grocer. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Madden, Lord st, Liverpool

Pagot, William, Wolverhampton, Engineer. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of Willcock, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Phillips, Daniel, Lewisham, Kent, Farmer. Nov 22 at 3 at Cannon st Hotel. Bristow and Sheppard, Cannon st

Piper, Thomas Richard, Portlaine, Sussex, Shopkeeper. Nov 15 at 12 at Terminus Hotel, Queens rd, Brighton. Hillman, Lewes

Platt, William Henry, Hollinwood, Lancaster, Builder. Nov 17 at 3 at Kings Arms Hotel, Yorkshire st, Oldham. Clark, Oldham

Pinner, Henry, Birmingham, Gun Barrel Maker. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Horton, Imperial chambers, Colmore row, Birmingham

Poole, William, Northampton, Builder. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Shoemith, Newland, Northampton

Pope, William Henry, David st, Baker st, Builder. Nov 15 at 3 at Law Institution, Chancery lane. Stollard and Whitting, South Molton st

Price, Edward, and Alfred Henry Arrows, Oldham, Lancaster, Tailors. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Watson, Church lo, Oldham

Raine, Charles, Wilton Park, Durham, Farmer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Mace, jun, Bishop Auckland

Riggall, James Kirby, Netherborough, Norfolk, Farmer. Nov 17 at 11 at Athenaeum chambers, King's Lynn. Wilkin

Robinson, Joseph, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Painter. Nov 12 at 3 at offices of Waclov, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Robinson, Robert, Sunderland, Durham, Grocer. Nov 5 at 11 at offices of Brown, John st, Sunderland

Rock, George, Westmoreland rd, Walworth, Grocer Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Pittman and Stuart, 5, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall st

Boyle, George, King st, Chesapeake, Warehouseman. Nov. 16 at 3 at Ironmonger-lane. Hare, Pinner's crt, Old Broad st

Sayle, Robert, Littleport, Cambridge, Beer Retailer. Nov 15 at 3 at Bell Hotel, Ely. Addison, Ely

Scampton, Thomas, Syston, Leicester, Hosiery Manufacturer. Nov 15 at 3 at George Hotel, Huddersfield. Loseby and Battiscombe, Leicester

Seattersgood, Arthur, Cannock, Stafford, out of business. Nov. 12 at 11 at George Hotel, Walsall. Bill, Walsall

Scott, Joe, Huddersfield, Rope Maker. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Mines and Swift, New st, Huddersfield

Shears, John, Wolverhampton, Chair Maker. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Dallow, Queen sq, Wolverhampton

Simpson, Joseph, South Bank, York, Grocer. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Catchpole, Argyle buildings, Wilson at

Smith, Henry Charles, Coaley, Gloucester, Baker. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Jackson, George st, Gloucester

Smith, Samuel, Hemingfield, York, Joiner. Nov 26 at 3 at offices of Maddison, Church st, Barnsley

Stevens, George, St. Mark's rd, Notting Hill, Builder. Nov 18 at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern, Greenham st. Wild & Co, Ironmonger lane

Sykes, John William, Huddersfield, Joiner. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Barker and Co, Estate bldgs, Huddersfield

Taylor, Thomas Edward, Newtown, Leeds, Gentleman. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Kemp, Barstow sq, Wakefield

Thirley, Frederick, Scarborough, York, Builder. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Hick, Newborough st, Scarborough

Thomas, Abraham, Liverpool, Currier. Nov 12 at 2.30 at offices of Brabner and Court, Court sq, Liverpool

Thorne, James Abraham, Helmet court, Strand, Steam Letterpress Printer. Nov 13 at 21 at offices of Schultz and Son, South sq, Gray's inn

Thornley, James, Nottingham, Lace Dresser. Nov 16 at 12 at offices of Thorpe and Thorpe, Friar lane, Nottingham

Umdleby, John, Leeds, out of business. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Brooke, East parade, Leeds

Waddell, John Craig, Norwich, Physician. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Winter and Francis, St Giles st, Norwich

Wade, Robert, Utlington, Chester, Farmer. Nov 11 at 3 at 66, Watergate st, Chester. Moss and Sharp, Chester

Wear, Edward, and William Henry Wear, Huddersfield, Plumbers. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Welsh, Queen st, Huddersfield

Wearne, Edwin, Gt Dover st, China Merchant. Nov 17 at 2 at office of Tilly and Soames, Finsbury pavement

Wells, Philip, and George Harrison, Aylestone, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 19 at 3 at offices of Owston and Dickinson, Friar lane, Leicester

Wilks, Isaac, Middlesbrough, York, Glazier. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees

Williamson, Charles Bailly, Lisson-grove, Paddington, Engineer. Nov 15 at 12 at offices of Mote, Walbrook

Williams Philip Charles, Holywell, Leicester, Foreman of an Ironworks. Nov 17 at 11 at offices of Barker, jun, Sharnard st, Melton Mowbray

Wilson, Thomas George, Bynasham, Oxford, Licensed Victualler. Nov 20 at 2 at Jones' Railway Hotel, near Great Western Railway Station, Oxford. Kilby and Mace, Chipping Norton

Woodley, Frederick, North Moreton, Berks, Licensed Victualler. Nov 17 at 12.30 at the Eight Bells Inn, Martin's-street, Wallingford

Woodrow, Henry Thomas, and Benjamin Kent, Liverpool, Manufacturing Stationers. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Pemberton and Co, Harrington st, Liverpool

Wright, James, Lambeth walk, Lambeth. Nov 19 at 2 at offices of Tisley, Abchurch yd

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA.

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet varnished with starch, &c., and is REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOA-TINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 8s., 5s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,

H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

MR. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON

(Opposite the British Museum).

Will be glad to forward his Pamphlet on Painless Dentistry, free, enclosed by post, which explains the most unique system of the adjustment of ARTIFICIAL TEETH without pain.

CONSULTATION FREE FROM 10 TO 5.

EDE AND SON

ROBE MAKERS

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Wools of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSELL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES UNIVERSITY CLERGY GOWNS, &c. ESTABLISHED 1649.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.